National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 45. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1866. WHOLE NO. 1,345.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

☞ ALL LETTERS on Business, or for Publication, should be addressed to PARKER PILLSBURY, *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

CLUB RATES.—Ten copies to one address, $2.50 each; twenty copies, $2 each.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

ROBERT J. JOHNSTON, PRINTER,

No. 33 BEEKMAN STREET, N. Y.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

COLORED POPULATION IN AND AROUND WASHINGTON

[The Washington correspondent of the Maine *State Press* gives the following interesting statistics.]

SOME facts and figures relative to the colored population of this vicinity may be of interest, as is everything, in fact, tending to throw any light upon the great problems connected with the colored race in this country. The colored population of Washington, as I learned during a recent visit to the Head quarters of the Freedman's Bureau, is 24,086, owning taxable property to the amount of $1,239,000, of whom 7,409 can read. There are in the city 22 schools for colored pupils, with 65 teachers, 3,441 scholars, averaging in attendance 2,343, of whom 1,590 are in the alphabet and primmer, 1,040 in geography, 1,688 in arithmetic, 1,456 in writing, and 105 in higher branches. The number of scholars is 96 more than at the last previous report, and the average attendance shows a gain of 73.

Alexandria has a colored population of 7,763 souls, owning property to the amount of $99,804, of whom 1,734 can read. The colored schools in that city are ten in number, with 20 teachers, 1,052 pupils, and an average attendance of 751. Of these scholars 292 are learning the alphabet, 248 geography, 645 arithmetic, 478 writing, and 62 higher branches.

Georgetown has a colored population numbering 3,400, owning $200,000, taxable property. There are four colored schools in that city, with six teachers and 376 pupils, average attendance 276, in alphabet 113, geography 59, arithmetic 120, writing 77, higher branches 19.

The Freedman's Village, Arlington Heights, Va., has a population of 927, of whom 168 are able to read. There are at this place 2 schools, with 5 teachers and 371 pupils.

There are also, under the superintendence of the Bureau, schools at Fort Strong, Camp Wadsworth, Fall's Church, Peach Grove, and Leesburg, Virginia; and also Good Hope, Md., and at Sixth District, County of Washington. Sunday and night schools are not included in the above statement.

There are, to recapitulate, in this Freedman's Bureau District, 45 schools, 106 teachers, 5,588 pupils, with an average attendance of 3,891, of whom 527 are over 16 years of age, 1,506 are always present, 1,279 are always punctual, 2,303 are learning the alphabet, 1,369 geography, 1,549 arithmetic, 2,061 writing, 189 the higher branches. The whole attendance is 391, and the average attendance 201 larger than at the last previous report. There are also in addition to the above 12 night schools with an attendance of 759 pupils.

"GARRISON AGAIN IN THE FIELD."—The Nashua (N. H.) *Gazette* says: "This hoary-headed traitor is again in the field. He made a speech at Brooklyn, N. Y., last week, in which he denounced the President in the vilest terms. Garrison is truly a 'philanthropist' of singular ferocity."

CONGRESS TO BE QUELLED BY THE BAYONET.

[The Democratic organs are already beginning to suggest that the President should employ the army to compel Congress to submit to his reconstruction policy. A writer in the Washington *Union*, which has been receiving Government patronage, says:]

"I AGAIN repeat that 'I caution no violence,' nor do I wish to see the second advent of Cromwell of England, or Napoleon of France, practiced upon the Radical destructionists in this Congress, but 'WHAT HAS BEEN MAY BE, AND WILL BE AGAIN, IF PRESIDENT JOHNSON IS THWARTED IN HIS GOOD INTENTIONS. The President must be sustained."

[The New York *Express* says:]

"The President has one advantage over King Thad. All the generals who are good for anything agree with him. In a revolution, you know, the generals are of a great deal more importance than the politicians. Words are nothing in comparison with guns, and, upon the whole, if there is to be a fight between the two Houses, and the two governments therein, better side with the 'heavy artillery' in the fight."

[The Macon (Georgia) *Telegraph* says:]

"WE AGREE WITH THE WRITER IN THE *Constitutional Union*. THE BALLOT-BOX IS TOO SLOW A PROCESS AS A REMEDY FOR EXISTING GRIEVANCES. LET THE PRESIDENT PUT DOWN THE REBELLION IN CONGRESS, AND APPEAL TO THE BALLOT-BOX TO SUSTAIN THAT. He is as much in duty bound to do it there as anywhere else, and unless the Northern people are greatly misrepresented, he will be triumphantly sustained by his countrymen of both sections. As was stated, some days ago, in the House, the course of the Radicals is purely a party trick to keep themselves in power, and they should not be allowed to dissolve the Union for any such wicked purpose. The South had a far better pretext when it resolved on separation. We prefer peaceable means, but these failing, the President should issue his proclamation declaring the Union fully restored, and inviting the Southern members of Congress to enter the Capitol and take their seats. IF REFUSED ADMITTANCE, A REGIMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS SHOULD BE SENT TO PUT THE SOUTHERN MEMBERS IN THEIR PLACES OVER THEM. THOUGH A SMALL MINORITY, RADICALISM COMBINED COULD NOT PUT THEM OUT."

[And on Friday last, the President received a delegation from Kentucky, whose ears he greatly delighted with the following address:]

The President briefly responded to the address of Mr. Dawson, tendering to those whom the delegation represented, and to the State of Kentucky, his unfeigned thanks for the kind expressions and manifestations of confidence in him personally, and the endorsement of the policy which shall control his administration. It was peculiarly gratifying to receive these assurances at this particular time. He trusted that results would show that the confidence thus reposed was not misplaced, and would never become a matter of regret upon the part of those who gave expression thereto. The present is regarded as a most critical juncture in the affairs of the nation—scarcely less so than when an armed and organized force sought to overthrow the Government. *To attack and attempt to cause a disruption of the Government by armed combination and military force, is no more dangerous to the life of the nation than an attempt to revolutionize and undermine it by a disregard and destruction of the safeguards thrown around the liberties of the people in the Constitution. Our stand has been taken. Our course is marked out. We shall take no step backward in this matter. No other or higher evidence of our purpose in this regard can be given than has already been furnished.* In the future, as in the past, we shall endeavor in good faith to make the administration of the affairs of the Government conform to the Constitution in its letter and spirit. Therein is the only guarantee for the liberties of the people. It is hoped, by an adherence to this rule, to remedy ere long all the irregularities and annoyances to which the people have been subjected. Again do we assure you that these demonstrations of confidence and assurances of support upon the part of the people are exceedingly cheering to us; that we are grateful for and properly appreciate them, and that our most earnest wish is so to discharge the trusts confided to us as to merit them.

Selections.

SPEECH OF HON. CHARLES SUMNER.

[On Wednesday last, 7th inst., Mr. Sumner addressed the Senate in substance as reported below for the New York *Tribune*. Sixteen years ago on that day, March 7th, 1850, Mr. Sumner's illustrious predecessor, Daniel Webster, made his memorable speech (also in the Senate), which gave the country the shame and dishonor of the Fugitive Slave Law of that year. The character and purpose of the two addresses are in wondrous contrast, and mark some growth, at least, in a diviner civilization. Mr. Webster spoke in defence of the theory "that a black man has no rights which a white man is bound to respect." Mr. Sumner contends that a law or constitution which makes distinctions in rights or privileges on account of color, *is entitled to no mortal man's respect, no matter what his color.* He spoke in opposition to the following proposed amendment to the Constitution, offered by Mr. Conkling of New York, in the House of Representatives, on the 15th day of January, and since adopted by that body, though defeated subsequently in the Senate:]

ARTICLE. Representatives shall be appointed among the several States which may be included in the Union, according to their respective number, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed. *Provided*, that whenever the elective franchise shall be denied or abridged in any State, on account of race or color, all persons therein of such race or color shall be excluded from the basis of such representation.

AT one o'clock, Wednesday, March 7, the pending constitutional amendment on the subject of representation was taken up.

MR. SUMNER said: Mr. President, I hesitate to enter again into this debate, which now, after the interjection of another debate on another question, is again renewed. I do it with unfeigned reluctance, and I hope not to trespass too much on your patience. The question before us, even its simplest form, is of incalculable importance; but it has an added interest, inasmuch as it opens the whole vast subject of Reconstruction. Into this field I shall not be tempted at this time, except to express a short opinion on the general principles we should seek to establish. Treason must be made odious, and to this end power must be secured to loyal fellow-citizens. In doing this two indispensable conditions must not be forgotten. First, all who have been untrue to the Republic must, for a certain time, constituting the transition period, be excluded from the partnership of Government; and secondly, all who have been true to the Government must be admitted into the partnership of Government according to the sovereign rule of the Constitution, which knows no distinction of color. Following these two simple commandments there will be safety and peace together with power and renown. Neglecting these two simple commandments there must be peril and distraction, together with imbecility and dishonor. In the one way reconstruction will be easy. In the other way it will be impossible. This is all I have to say at present on Reconstruction, and I turn at once to the precise question before us. Pardon me, Sir, if I remind you here on the threshold that there are two modes of debate. One is to attack the previous speaker with personality, or criticism of manner; the other is to speak plainly on the question and to deal directly according to your convictions with the principles involved. Sometimes these two modes are allowed to intermingle. If ever there was an occasion when the first should be carefully avoided; when the question alone should be handled, and not the previous speaker; when the attention should be directed exclusively to the principles involved, and not to any subordinate point of mere form, it is now, when we are asked to insert a new provision in the Constitution fixing the basis of political power at the expense of fellow-citizens counted by millions. In this spirit I shall try to say what I have to say. For my mind the occasion is too solemn for personal controversy, and I shall not be drawn into it. The proposition now before you is the most important ever brought before Congress, unless, perhaps, we may except the amendment abolishing slavery; and to my mind it is the most utterly reprehensible and unpardonable. The same sentiment which led us to hail the abolition of slavery with gratitude, as the triumph of justice, should make us reject with indignation a device to crystallize into organic law the disfranchisement of a race. It is with infinite regret that I differ from valued friends about me, but I cannot do otherwise. In exposing such an attempt I must speak frankly, as on other occasions, in exposing the crime against Kansas, or the infamy of that enactment which turned the whole North into a hunting-ground, where man was game. The attempt is on a larger scale, and is more essentially bad than the crime against Kansas, or the Fugitive Slave bill. Such a measure, so obnoxious to every argument of reason, justice and feeling, so perilous to the national peace, and so injurious to the good name of the Republic, must be encountered as we encounter a public enemy. There is no language which can adequately depict its character. Thinking of it, I am reminded of those words of Chatham, where he held up to undying judgment a measure of the British Ministry, which I think had already received the sanction of the House of Commons, as the present attempt has received the sanction of the House of Representatives. Chatham did not hesitate, nor did he tame his words, but exclaimed, "I am astonished, shocked to hear such principles confessed, to hear them avowed in this House, or in this country; principles equally unconstitutional, inhuman and unchristian. I call upon you to stamp upon them an indelible stigma of public abhorrence." Then, rising to a still higher flight, he exclaimed, "My Lords, I am old and weak, and at present unable to say more, but my feelings and indignation were too strong to have said less. I could not have slept this night in my bed, nor reposed my head on my pillow, without giving this vent to my eternal abhorrence of such preposterous and enormous principles!" But what is the measure which thus aroused the veteran orator compared with that which is now before us. It was only a transient act of wrong, small in its proportions, which he denounced. I am to denounce an act of wrong permanent in its influence, colossal in its proportions, operating in an extensive region, affecting millions of citizens, endangering the peace of the country, and covering its name with dishonor. Such is the character of the present attempt. I exhibit it as I see it. Others may not see it so. The British ministry did not see the measure which Chatham denounced as he saw, and as history now sees it. Of course, Senators would not support the present proposition if they thought it disgraceful, nor would the British Ministry have supported that earlier proposition had they thought it disgraceful. Unhappily, they did not think so. But I trust you will be warned by their example. With the eloquence of Chatham, another person, from his place in the House of Lords, denounced the slave system, which, at that time, had the sanction of both Houses of Parliament. I refer to Brougham. He did not hesitate to exclaim, "Prodigious, portentous injustice;" and then continuing, he exclaimed again, "The gross, the foul, the outrageous, the incredible injustice of which we are daily and hourly guilty toward the whole of the ill-fated African race." But how small was the injustice which aroused his execration compared to that which you are now asked to perpetuate in constitutional law. The crime which he arraigned was against 800,000 persons in distant islands, to whom the people of Great Britain were bound by no gratitude, and who were to them only fellow men. The crime which I now arraign is against 4,000,000 of persons constituting a considerable portion of the people of the United States, to whom we are bound by ties of gratitude and who are to us fellow-citizens. From the moment I first heard this proposition read at the desk, I have been unable to think of it without pain. The reflection that it might find a place in the Constitution, or even that it might be sanctioned by Congress, is intolerable; and this becomes more so when I call to mind the circumstances by which we are surrounded and the exigency of the hour. Lord Bacon tells us that the highest function which man can be called to perform on earth is that of founders of states, or as he expresses it, "*conditores imperi.*" Such is the duty now before us. We are to help in this great work by a fundamental provision which shall fix the basis of our political system for an indefinite future. There are none among the great lawgivers of history who have had a sublimer task. But this duty is enhanced when we consider that it is the consequence and sequel of unparalleled war. At a moment of peace such a duty would be commanding but, it is now reenforced by exceptional considerations arising from the exceptional condition of affairs. For four years rebellion in the largest proportions known to authentic history raged among us, threatening to rend this Republic in twain. Millions of treasure were sacrificed; lives more precious than any treasure were heaped in hecatombs; families were filled with mourning in the terrible struggle. While the country was bleeding at every pore, and the scales of battle hung doubtful, assistance came from an unexpected quarter. Intermixed with the false men who warred on the Republic were more than 3,000,000 slaves, shut out from rights of all kinds, and compelled to do the bidding of masters. The slaves became our benefactors; they were kind to our captive soldiers; sheltering them, feeding them, supplying their wants; and thus there was in the very heart of the rebellion a filial throb for the Republic. At last arms were put into the hands of these benefactors; and 200,000 brave allies, representatives of an unmustered host, leaped forward in defense of the national cause. The Republic was saved; the Rebellion was at an end. Meanwhile the good President, who at that time guided our affairs, put forth his immortal proclamation, declaring that these slaves are, and henceforth shall be, free. Not stopping with this declaration, he proceeded to announce that the Executive Government of the United States, including the military and naval authorities thereof, will recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons. Thus was the Republic solemnly pledged to these benefactors, first by the ties of gratitude that should be enduring, and secondly, by an open promise in the face of the civilized world; and this promise was taken up and adopted by the people of the United States, when by a Constitutional amendment they expressly empowered Congress to maintain this freedom by appropriate legislation. And now, sir, called as we are to re-adjust the foundations of political power, which are materially changed by the disappearance of slavery, and called also to perform sacred promises to benefactors in harmony with sacred promises of our fathers, while at the same time we save the name of the Republic from dishonor, and see that the national peace is not imperilled. Congress is about to liquidate all these inviolable obligations by a new compromise of human rights, and so far as it can to place the compromise in the text of the Constitution, thus establishing a false foundation of political power, violating the national faith, dishonoring the name of the Republic, and imperiling the national peace. Others have dwelt on the inadequacy of this proposition, even for its avowed purposes, conceived in a desire to do indirectly what ought to be done directly, and thus "by indirection find direction out." It must naturally share the conditions of such a device. Falstaff tells us that "wit may be made a jackanapes, when 'tis upon an ill employ;" but what ill employ ever equalled that of this attempt? Looking at this compromise in its most general aspect, it reminds me, if you will pardon the illustration, of that leg of mutton served for dinner on the road from London to Oxford, which Dr. Johnson, with characteristic energy, described as "bad as bad could be, ill-fed, ill-killed, ill-kept, and ill-dressed." So this compromise—I adopt the saying of an eminent friend, who insists that it cannot be called an amendment, but rather a detriment to the Constitution—is as bad as bad can be, and even for its avowed purpose, it is uncertain, loose, cracked, and ricketty. Regarding it as a proposition from Congress to meet the unparalleled exigencies of the present hour, it is no better than the muscipular abortion sent into the world by the parturiant mountain. But it is only when we look at the chance of good from it that this compromise is muscipular. Regarding it in every other aspect it is infinite, inasmuch as it makes the Constitution a well-spring of insupportable thraldom, and once more lifts the sluices of blood, destined to run until it comes to the horse's bridle. Adopt it, and you will put millions of fellow-citizens under the ban of excommunication; you will hand them over to a new *anathema maranatha;* you will declare that they have no political rights which white men are bound to respect, thus repeating in a new form that abomination which has blackened the name of Taney. Adopt it, and you will stimulate anew the war of race upon race. Slavery itself was a war of race upon race, and this is only a new form of this terrible war. The proposition is as hardy as it is gigantic, for it takes no account of the moral sense of mankind, which is the same as if in rearing a monument we took no account of the law of gravitation. It is the paragon and masterpiece of ingratitude, showing more than any other act of history what is so often charged, and we so fondly deny, that "Republics are ungrateful." The freedmen ask for bread and you send them a stone; with piteous voice they ask for protection; you thrust them back unprotected into the cruel den of their former masters. Such an attempt thus bad as bad can be, thus abortive for all good, thus perilous, thus pregnant with a war of race upon race, thus shocking to the moral sense, and thus treacherous to those whom we are bound to protect, cannot be otherwise than shameful. Adopt it, and you will fix a stigma upon the very name of Republics. As to the imagination there are mountains of light, so are there mountains of darkness, and this is one of them; it is the very Kohinoor of blackness.

After quoting Otis, Franklin, and other authorities on the subject of taxation and representation, Mr. Sumner stated his objections to the pending proposition, and summed them up as follows:

Mr. President, such is the argument for the rejection of the pending proposition. Following it from the beginning you have seen, first how this proposition carries into the Constitution itself the idea of inequality of rights, thus defaming that unspotted text; secondly, how it is an express sanction of the acknowledged tyranny of taxation without representation; thirdly, how it is a concession to State rights at a moment when we are recovering from a terrible war waged against us in the name of State rights; fourthly, how it is the Constitutional recognition of an oligarchy, aristocracy, caste, and monopoly founded on color; fifthly, how it embodies the wretched pretensions of a white man's Government; sixthly, how it assumes what is false in constitutional law, that color can be a qualification for an elector; seventhly, how it positively ties the hands of Congress in fixing the meaning of a republican government, so that under the guarantee clause it will be constrained to recognize an oligarchy, aristocracy, caste and monopoly, together with the tyranny of taxation without representation as not inconsistent with such a Government; eighthly, how it positively ties the hands of Congress in completing and consummating the abolition of slavery in pursuance of the second clause of the Constitutional amendment, so that it cannot for this purpose interfere with the denial of the elective franchise on account of color; ninthly, how it installs recreant Rebels in permanent power over loyal citizens; and tenthly, how it shows forth, in unmistakable characters, as a compromise of human rights, the most immoral, indecent and utterly shameful of any in our history. All this you have seen with pain and sorrow I trust. Who that is moved to sympathy for his fellow man can listen to the story without indignation? Who that has not lost the power of reason can fail to see the cruel wrongs? And now the question occurs, What shall be done to this? I answer, reject at once the pending proposition; show it no favor; give it no quarter; let the country see that you are impatient of its presence. But there are other propositions in the form of substitutes. For any one of these I can vote. They may differ in efficiency, but there is nothing in them immoral or shameful. There is nothing in the proposition to found representation on voters instead of population; and secondly, the proposition to secure equality in political rights by Constitutional amendment, or by act of Congress. Referring to the proposition to found representation upon voters, Mr. Sumner said: The proposition to found representation on voters instead of population was originally introduced by me during the last Congress. Almost at the same time I introduced a series of resolutions, declaring not only the power but the duty of the United States to guarantee republican governments in the Rebel States on the basis of the Declaration of Independence, so that the new governments should be founded on the consent of the governed, and the equality of all persons before the law. Thus, while proposing to found representation on voters, I at the same time asserted the power of Congress, under the Constitution, to secure equality in political rights. The proposition with regard to voters was much discussed during the recess of Congress. At the beginning of the present session it seemed to find favor. But, at last, statistics were adduced tending to show that it would transfer power from Eastern States to Western States in proportion to the excess of females over males in the latter. And this "abnormal condition" was made an argument against it. Since then, it has given place to the offensive proposition now before the Senate. The proposition to found representation on votes instead of population, may be seen first in what it does not do, and secondly in what it does do. Seeing it in what it does not do, all will confess that it does not carry into the Constitution itself the idea of inequality of rights, thus defiling that unspotted text; that it gives no sanction to the acknowledged tyranny of taxation without representation; that it makes no concession to State rights at a moment when we are recovering from a terrible war waged against us in the name of State rights; that it does not recognize an oligarchy, aristocracy, caste and monopoly founded on color; that it does not embody the wretched pretension of a white man's government; that it does not assume what is false in Constitutional law, that color can be a qualification for a voter; that it does not positively tie the hands of Congress in fixing the meaning of a republican government, so that under the guarantee clause it will be constrained to recognize an oligarchy, aristocracy, caste and monopoly, together with the tyranny of taxation without representation, as not inconsistent with such a government; that it does not positively tie the hands of Congress in completing and consummating the abolition of slavery in pursuance of the second clause of the Constitutional amendment; that it does not install recent Rebels in permanent power over loyal citizens; that it does not show forth an unmistakable character as a compromise of human rights the most immoral, indecent and utterly shameful of any in our history. All these things, so offensive to the conscience and the reason, this proposition does not do; in all these respects it is at least blameless. On the other hand, without inflicting any stigma upon the Constitution, or upon the Republic, without making any concession to the States, without tying the hands of Congress, and without any compromise of human rights, it does re-arrange the basis of representation so as to accomplish all that is proposed even by the most sanguine supporters of the other proposition, and it does this effectually without the opportunity for evasion which is afforded by the other proposition. The alleged irregularity in its operation, owing to the excess of females over males, in certain States, may make you hesitate to adopt it; but better take representation founded on voters even with any such alleged irregularity than do a grievous wrong. Better even wrong yourselves than wrong others. Representation founded on voters seems to be commended by authority and principle. Its adoption now would at least give symmetry to our national system and make the Representative more precisely the embodied presence of his constituents, while at the same time, it would tend to enlarge the suffrage and to harmonize sectional pretensions with the national will, when exerted for human rights. If representation were founded on voters, the States would care little if Congress should annul inequality in the elective franchise on account of color. But there are other propositions which, to my mind, are more satisfactory because they reach the special necessities of the hour, and provide the only effectual remedy. Speaking in the name of national justice, and for the national safety, they cannot be put aside with indifference; nor is it wise to say that any measure of justice is not practical—I refer, of course, to the propositions, in different forms, to secure that great guarantee—equality in political rights, by Constitutional amendment or by act of Congress, or by both. A Constitutional amendment which shall place eqality of political rights under the safeguard of a special text may be superfluous, but it is not unconstitutional or immoral. It will be supplementary to provisions already in the Constitution, and will be in the nature of a declaratory statute, removing all doubts and cavils; it will be like an additional force in mechanics, or like a reenforcement in the field. It will be reduplication in a new form. On such an occasion, where such a cause is in issue, I welcome every alliance, and such I regard the proposition of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Henderson). The other proposition which looks to the direct action of Congress under the existing Constitution and its amendment, is obviously the simplest and most practical, inasmuch as it deals with the exigency promptly, frankly, and according to the necessities of the hour. It does not undertake to act by induction, nor does it postpone to any indefinite future what cannot be postponed without detriment to the Republic. Refusing to procrastinate, it saves all. Such a proposition is commended by every argument of reason, humanity and patriotism. To say that it is not Constitutional is to say that the Constitution itself is not Constitutional; for it is derived from the very heart of the Constitution and is filled with all its best life-blood. Something has been said of the form in which the proposition has been presented. There is the bill of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Yates), which he has maintained in a speech of singular originality and power that has not been answered, and I do not hesitate to say cannot be answered. By this bill it is provided that all citizens in any State or Territory shall be protected in the full and equal enjoyment and exercise of their civil, political rights, including the right of suffrage. This is founded on the consideration that by the abolition of slavery the slave became at once a citizen, subject only to such disabilities as are common to other citizens; and that by the second clause of the Constitutional amendment Congress is empowered to enforce the abolition of slavery by appropriate legislation. On this foundation the Senator places his bill, assuming that to complete the abolition of slavery, all restrictions, penalties or deprivations of right resulting from slavery in any State or Territory must be made to cease. The proposition which I have had the honor of presenting is a joint resolution, which, after declaring the duty of Congress to guarantee a republican form of government in States where the governments have lapsed, and also the duty to complete the abolition of slavery by the removal of all relics of this wrong, proceeds to provide that there shall be no oligarchy, aristocracy, caste or monopoly, nor any denial of rights, civil or political, on account of color or race, but all persons shall be equal before the law, whether in the court-room or at the ballot-box. Not doubting the power of Congress to carry out this principle everywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States, I content myself for the present by asserting it only in the lapsed States lately in rebellion, where the duty to guarantee a republican government and enforce the abolition of slavery are beyond question. To that extent I now urge it. But the propositions are opposed as informal and inoperative because they are without machinery or penalty; such is the objection, if I understand it, as it has been made. I answer each proposition, on its face, is an act of Congress, prohibiting the denial of certain rights on account of color; in this respect each is at least a Congressional interpretation of the Constitution, and it is by no means clear that it could not be enforced in the courts. The bill which has already passed the House of Representatives, striking out the word "white," in the electoral laws of the District of Columbia, is without machinery or penalty, but it is at least a Congressional declaration to be followed of course by other legislation with proper machinery and penalty, and this is the precise character of the proposition presented by the Senator from Illinois and by myself. Of course, the objections to these propositions, if valid at all, must be equally valid against the bill for enfranchisement in the District of Columbia, and against every other Congressional declaration without machinery or penalty. It is, at most, an objection of form which I put aside and advance at once to the substance. The question is too vast, and the times are too serious for a special demurrer. It must be tried on its merits. This question is as to the power of Congress to establish equality of political rights at least in the Rebel States. If Congress has this beneficent power, then exercise it in such form as shall seem best with machinery and penalty, or without machinery and penalty. But in God's name exercise it for the sake of the country which suffers from your delay.

Mr. Sumner next argued the power of Congress to enfranchise the blacks; and after quoting from Supreme Court decisions to prove that by the abolition of slavery, the blacks of the country became citizens, he said: "Therefore, I do not hesitate to say that when the slaves of our country became citizens, they took their place in the body politic as a component part of the people, entitled to equal rights, and under the protection of these two guardian principles. First, that all just governments stand on the consent of the governed; and, Secondly, That taxation without representation is tyranny; and these rights it is the duty of Congress to guarantee, as essential to the idea of a Republic. The aspiration of Abraham Lincoln in his marvellous utterances at Gettysburg, was that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, should not perish from the earth;" but who will venture to exclude millions of citizens from the people? If the governments in the Rebel States are brought to this touch-stone it will be found that they must fail. The departure from the true standard is not merely theoretical as it might be regarded in States where the disfranchised are few in number, but there is an absolute failure to come within the conditions required. It is not decent to call a State republican where more than a majority of its people, constituting the larger part of the body politic, is permanently disfranchised. Nor is it decent to call a State republican where any considerable portion of its people, constituting an essential part of its body politic, is permanently disfranchised. Even if, in past times, such a State could have been treated as republican, it will not do to treat it so now. It lacks the vital elements of a republican government, and must be treated accordingly. I do not dwell on this point, for it seems absurd to call it in question. Clearly it is your duty to enforce the guarantee of a republican government. By the oaths you have taken to support the Constitution, you must take care that in all States where the governments have lapsed, this guarantee shall be carried out. In the performance of this duty, you may proceed either by an enabling act establishing in advance the conditions on which these States shall be restored to their practical relations with the Union, or by an act directly annulling all constitutions and laws of any such States inconsistent with a republican government. The power is in Congress. It has been recognized in formal terms by the Supreme Court, and you are the final judge of the means you shall employ. To say that you have not the power, is to abdicate in a great exigency the very means of salvation; it is to fling away your arms in the very face of the enemy; it is to spike the Constitution at a moment when its full volley is needed for the overthrow of wrong. Clearly, you have the power, and upon your heads will be the fearful responsibility if you fail to exercise it."

In conclusion Mr. Sumner said: Sir, the freedmen must be protected and not sacrificed. You can do it, but only in one way. Paper will not do it. Parchment will not do it. Give to him the strength which comes from the fulness of citizenship and he will then be protected. Do not hesitate to follow principles. They are like those divine promises, which, when properly understood and applied, will answer every case of difficulty or distress, and as in the Pilgrim's Progress, will open any lock in Doubting Castle. Have faith. Difficulties disappear before the earnest man. To the boatman who said it was impossible to brave the storm that was raging, William Tell, full of patriotic purpose, cried out: "I know not whether it be possible, but I know that it must be attempted," and the deliverer reached his destination. The same courage is needed now. The attempt at least must be made, and who can say it will fail? On its side will be Providence, the prayers of good men, nature in her manifold attributes, and the awakened judgment of the civilized world. The time has passed when the spirit of caste can continue to bear sway. See to it, Senators, that this spirit has no foothold in the Constitution of our country. To this duty I summon you now by every obligation of statesmanship, for the sake of the Republic, and for your own sakes, to the spirit of caste answer back in the spirit of that Christian truth which you have been taught. Recall the precious words of the early English writer who, describing the good sea captain, tells us that he courts the image of God nevertheless. But the good statesman must be like that good sea-captain. His ship is the State, which he keeps safe on its track. He, too, must see the image of God in all his fellow men, and in the discharge of his responsible duties must set his face forever against any recognition of inequality in human rights. Other things you may do, but this you must not do.

THE NEXT DANGER.—The Roxbury (Mass.) *Journal* says: "What the people in this Union have now most to dread is *compromise*. The air is rife with rumors of it the present week. There is a visible lowering in the tone of the President. He has discarded bullying for another species of weapon. We hear of him talking to Gov. Cox, of Ohio, very much as he talked, months and weeks ago, to Geo. L. Stearns and Senator Fessenden. A member of Congress snatches at the bait. Mr. Sherman, of Ohio, makes a speech in which, while declaring, at the outset, his conviction that Congress is entirely right in its position, he talks on both sides of the question till he almost leaves the impression that the President is, after all, an injured man, and that Congress is harsh and unreasonable in opposing his wishes. We know not how far that body is prepared to follow Mr. Sherman, but, realizing the weak and temporizing quality of too many of our politicians, we have serious apprehensions. The worst results would follow such a course." [But more alarming than all, is "*the lowering in the tone*" of Congress.]

HOW PRESIDENTIAL PROGRESS IS SEEN.—Six months ago Andrew Johnson wrote the following letter to his newly made Provisional Governor of Mississippi. What is he saying to-day?

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
WASHINGTON, D. C. August 15, 1865.

Gov. WM. L. SHARKEY, Jackson, Miss:

I am gratified to see that you have organized your Convention without difficulty. I hope that without delay your convention will amend your State Constitution, abolishing slavery, and denying to all future Legislatures the power to legislate that there is property in man; also that they will adopt the Amendment to the Constitution of the United States abolishing slavery. If you could extend the elective franchise to all persons of color who can read the Constitution of the United States in English, and write their names, and to all persons of color who own real estate valued at not less than $250, and pay taxes thereon, you would completely disarm the adversary, and set an example the other States will follow. This you can do with perfect safety, and you thus place the Southern States, in reference to free persons of color, upon the same basis with the Free States. I hope and trust your Convention will do this, and as a consequence the Radicals, who are wild upon Negro Franchise, will be completely foiled in their attempts to keep the Southern States from renewing their relations to the Union, by not accepting their Senators and Representatives.

ANDREW JOHNSON, President United States.

OUTRAGES IN TENNESSEE.—The Nashville *Union* says: "On Saturday, 3d inst., a man named Ransom, who resides in Marshall County, in this State, arrived in this city and called on Colonel Shafter, and made a statement, which would indicate that there is a band of outlaws and guerillas hovering around in that county, who need to feel the strong arm of the military before they will learn their duty to their country and to humanity.

"He is owner of a large tract of land, which he has rented in small parcels, to some forty negro families, who had commenced working the same, much to the disgust of a few worthless villains in the neighborhood, who, too lazy to work themselves, were unwilling to see the blacks thrive by industry, and they accordingly determined to break up Mr. Ransom's plantation by some means—fair or foul.

"Accordingly, about a week since, finding that Mr. R. did not heed their remonstrances, they visited a negro house and stole away a boy, whom they kept for some days, at the end of which time he escaped and returned home; but on the following night two armed men went to the house of the child and again took him away; but a body of negroes pursued the captors, and finally rescued him—the whole being accomplished without bloodshed.

"On the next day, however, six or eight men, all well armed, visited Mr. Ransom's house, and made threats against him; but he and a portion of his hands, all being armed, succeeded in driving them off, wounding one of the assailants severely, and perhaps mortally.

"Mr. R. at once set out for Nashville to ask military protection, and while absent the marauders returned and drove the negroes from the plantation. Col. Shafter at once detailed two officers and twenty-five men, who left for the scene of the troubles yesterday."

JAMAICA.

[The revelations now making by the Government Commission of the terrible atrocities perpetrated on the poor blacks of Jamaica last Autumn, are waking the wonder—the horror, even—of mankind. Even the Democracy of this country, the most desperate types of it, are beginning to shudder with everybody else. The last New York *Sunday Mercury* refers to the subject in this manner:]

"The investigation into the conduct of Gov. Eyre in suppressing the recent negro insurrection in Jamaica, is eliciting facts of the most atrocious character. The negroes were flogged, tortured, and slaughtered, whether guilty or not. The Provost Marshal proclaimed in the presence of a number of prisoners, some tried and condemned, that if any of them would give evidence against Gordon, they would be pardoned. Women were flogged in the presence of their children; and men who were hanged were put to willful torture, by not having a sufficient drop, and thus subjecting them to slow strangulation. The descriptions of these and similar scenes, which appear in the English papers, exceed anything recorded since the excesses of the French Revolution."

[A Special Commisioner for the London *Star* commences a letter of many columns in that able journal thus, which, with a few anecdotes and statements from it, will be all we can make room for to-day:]

"KINGSTON, Jamaica, Jan. 24.

"I am about to unfold a tale of horror. Probably at the present moment I know more of the measures taken for the suppression of the 'rebellion' than almost any one individual in Jamaica, not excepting the officials who took part in it, as their knowledge is limited to their own particular share in the deeds of violence and bloodshed. Before this letter can return here, most of the facts which I am now about generally to detail will doubtless have been given in evidence before the Commissioners. Earl Russell may well be satisfied that he decided to suspend Gov. Eyre. The last month or two of his reign were veritable days of terror to every friend of the blacks in Jamaica, whatever the color of their own skin."

[Paul Bogle and Geo. W. Gordon were most malignantly pursued, and men, women and children were put to terrible tortures to extort testimony against them.]

"Nine of the Stoney Gut men were hanged in what is called Paul Bogle's Chapel. I was told so by a woman who had fled to the woods with her husband and her sick children. Her house was burned and all their little property destroyed, and they lay for two nights in the bush with their young ones amid the pouring torrents of rain. One of the poor babies got cramped with cold and hunger, and the mother in spite of her terror ventured at night ont of their lair to endeavor to find shelter in the ruins of the chapel. She stealthily entered; but imagine her horror when looking up she saw the grisly forms of nine of her neighbors swinging round responsive to the night blast. A return to the wood and the wet lair among the frogs was better than this, and so she hastened back. The woman, however, was afterwards caught and flogged."

* * * * * * *

"I have not seen the scored backs of any women who stated that they were flogged, but I have seen the scored backs of men. There is one poor fellow now under the care of Dr. Phillippo, of Spanish Town, who says he was twice flogged—once for not touching his hat to the Provost-Marshal Ramsay, another time getting one hundred lashes before being discharged 'to teach him manners.'"

* * * * * * *

"For every single statement I have already made, or may make hereafter, I could give names, dates, residences, and confirmatory witnesses, and if I abstain from doing so at present it is merely because I deem it best at the present stage of the inquiry to give a foreshadowing of what the people of England may expect to be brought out rather than to forestall the detailed reports of the evidence which will doubtless be published as the commission proceeds."

* * * * * * *

"A man was arrested at Stoney Gut, but he was carried to Morant Bay, and need I say what his fate was? On his way to the gallows his son, a young lad, who had been sent down to watch his father's fate, and to show him he was not forgotten by his own, approached to bid him farewell, and the old man as the only token of affection he could bestow took off his hat, which was a new one, and was handing it to his son. 'What is that stoppage?' yelled the Provost-Marshal. The cause was explained to him. 'Tie him up and give him a dozen,' he roared; and the boy was tied to a gun and flogged while the father was being executed."

* * * * * * *

"One morning while it was still dark a party of soldiers burst into a cottage at Coaley. The husband started from his bed and tried to escape; but the soldiers were too quick for him, and a rifle-bullet was sent through his shoulder, while the wife and children screamed with terror. Wounded as he was the man dashed into the bush and was preserved, although his arm is now useless. There were thus only the woman and children left upon whom the brave veterans could exercise their valor. The children clung screaming to their mother until they were threatened with death by the intruders. The mother herself was tied with rope, and preparation made for her punishment if she did not discover instantly the hiding-place of Paul Bogle. She in vain protested her ignorance. Knowledge would, probably, have been fatal to her; ignorance could not save her. By the special orders of Mr. Ramsay, who accompanied the party, she was cast down with her face to the floor, stained with the freshly-shed blood of her husband, and in presence of her children received fifty lashes on her naked body. Her hands were then tied, and she was carried to Paul Bogle's Chapel and fastened up outside while

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1866.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

NO STATE SHALL MAKE ANY DISTINCTION IN CIVIL RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES AMONG THE NATURALIZED CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES RESIDING WITHIN ITS LIMITS, OR AMONG PERSONS BORN ON ITS SOIL OF PARENTS PERMANENTLY RESIDENT THERE, ON ACCOUNT OF RACE, COLOR, OR DESCENT.

GNATS AND CAMELS.

SOME enterprising and promising young men of this city have entered the realm of Letters, and opened a banqueting saloon under the sign of the *Round Table*. It is a weekly publication, something after the manner of the London Weeklies, at six dollars per annum, or three dollars for six months. It is certainly a very readable journal; many of its articles being of solid, substantial worth, so far as literature, pure and simple, can ever claim so high a compliment. Having thus given the *Round Table* an advertisement, we solicit a chair at it a moment, while we make a few remarks, applicable not to it alone, but to much of the literary and religious criticism of the present hour. It may be presumptuous for us, who have seen the temple of literature only from the vale far below, to look, even from such a distance, within its imposing portals; but the risk and result will be our own, if any evil follow.

Literature, like religion, may be show or substance. It may be very good—is becoming constantly, let us hope, better and better. The *Round Table* should be alive to that most important consideration. Astrology has given place to astronomy since the days of Lord Bacon; and medical science treats diseases more wisely even with drugs and minerals, than did the old sorcerers with incantations and enchantments. The story of the "Good Samaritan" is worth the whole Levitical law to the hypocritical, selfish, and sordid Saxon race, were it but understood. It would have spared our millions of slaves all the woes and torments of slavery, and our nation and ourselves the blood, agony, and anguish of the war, as the just retribution, had we known its true meaning and application. The Temple at Jerusalem, and King Solomon in all his glory at the dedication, were to be eclipsed forever by this one utterance of a Jewish youth of the humblest birth, "God is a spirit, and they who worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." Florence Nightingale in the hospitals at Scutari was worth more to mankind, to humanity, to true worship, than all the emblazoned masses in St. Petersburg, and the protestations and ablutions in the Mosques of Constantinople. Surprising feats of horsemanship are seen within the circus ring; but one lightning dash of Egyptian Mamelukes at the battle of the Pyramids, or the shuddering charges of the French cavalry at Waterloo, reduce all such mountebank mysteries to the vulgarest fraction.

Literature certainly may be illustrated somewhat in this manner. And so also religion. Ruskin, in his earlier writings, held the artist to the "higher law;" to the law of the Highest; though it made havoc of the Cartoons of Raphael, and convicted the proudest achievements of the old masters in the Vatican, of downright blasphemy against all truth and fact. Large license, undoubtedly, should be allowed to poetry, to literature, to art, but never one jot or tittle at the expense of truth, or justice, or humanity. Indeed, unless these are aids to justice and freedom, they are contraband, vagabond, no matter how well dressed or genteel of carriage and deportment.

Some of these thoughts accompanied our reading in a recent number of the *Round Table* (which a friend loaned us) an article headed "Profanity in High Places." Never having been addicted to the vice of profane swearing, nor approved of it, we were glad to see a title which was promise of a testimony against it, in a literary journal. But the profanity which has so grieved the *Round Table* is not that which often offends. It is in this wise; for convenience varied slightly, but without violence to the sense:

> The vice of common swearing is undoubtedly less prevalent in our days than it was half a century ago. Oaths have ceased to form a part of fashionable conversation among educated people. But another sort of profanity has become fearfully in vogue of late years. We refer to the application of the most-sacred texts of the Bible to the commonest secular topics. • • • • • • When Burns, the fugitive slave, was the subject of that long controversy before the Commissioner in Boston which terminated in his being surrendered to his master, a clergyman of a neighboring city preached an elaborate discourse, in which the trial of Burns was likened to that of Jesus, and the surrender of the fugitive negro made of hardly inferior importance to the delivery of the Saviour to be crucified.
>
> It might have been hoped that profanity so shocking would have cured itself, and that we should have had no more of it in our day, either from the pulpit, the forum, or the platform. But a similar spirit of irreverence seems to have broken out afresh. Mr. Sumner's eulogy on President Lincoln was offensive in this respect. In the printed copy of that eulogy we find in capital letters the words of one of the prophets which have always been interpreted as the prefiguration of the Saviour—"I will make a man more precious than fine gold, even a man, than the golden wedge of Ophir"—applied to that grand regeneration of the negro which Mr. Sumner anticipates as the result of emancipation! • • • When was anything heard, either in high places or in low places, more revolting to every Christian soul than the language of this Senator, in pleading the cause of negro suffrage, when he appealed to the Senate "not to copy the example of Pontius Pilate, who surrendered the Saviour of the world, in whom he found no fault at all, to be scourged and crucified, while he set at large Barabbas, of whom the gospel says, in simple words, 'Now Barabbas was a robber.'"

That Scripture phraseology is often improperly and thoughtlessly used, profanely even, if that be possible, none will deny. But his life should be very pure, and his hands very white from the blood of slavery, who will dare arraign Mr. Sumner thus. This very article contains language which seems to us at least, a thousand times more profane and blasphemous than any word of his on that occasion. So when slavery was exhibited in lectures, twenty and thirty years ago, and some of its most revolting features partially exposed, many would stop their ears and rush out of the house crying "shocking," "shameful," "profane" "obscene!" and then appeal to the mob to go in and break up the meeting. Many times have we so seen it. The stripping and whipping of defenceless women, young and old, the selling of girls in the market for purposes not to be named, the brutal examinations to which they were subjected, and the loathsome language in which their qualities were described in newspaper advertisements, all these were tolerated by Northern church members, ministers, men, women, all classes, and by multitudes gloried in, as high art in civilization, as fulfilment of prophecy, as millennializing Ethiopa, and greater than all, giving strength and glory to our Constitution, Union, and Government. The men who did these very abominations came up, and not only bought our merchandise and sat in our Congress, but studied at our Colleges and Theological Seminaries, sat at our sacramental suppers, preached in our pulpits and wooed and married our sisters and daughters. There was no taint of "profanity," impurity or indecency in all this. It was propriety and purity; even *piety* itself. It was sin, impurity, profanity, to expose the shameful outrages, not to perpetrate them. The churches, the great denominations that invited and welcomed slave-breeders and slaveholders to their Theological Seminaries, Pulpits, and Sacramental tables, excommunicated large numbers of godly men and devout women, for no offence but refusing to thus have communion with Belial in the name of Christ; to drink the cup of devils in the name of the Lord.

The *Round Table* is to be commended for its rebuke of "*profanity in high places*," or low places. But two enquiries may be proper here. One, whether it is profane to use the language of the Bible as did Mr. Sumner, even supposing the text as sacred as the most orthodox believer. Rather does not Mr. Sumner pay it profound respect in borrowing its word to utter the most important and sublime truths ever spoken, even by the writers of the book itself? And did he not also pay himself high compliment, in being so well read in the book as to be thus able to command it into his service? Surely, those best read in any work, will be most likely as well as able to use it on important occasions.

But the other and more important consideration is, whether the deed done, or proposition, defended or opposed, constitutes the real offence, or whether it is merely a question of manner. The *Round Table* speaks of "*Mr. Sumner's favorite negro theories.*" And what are they? Do they transcend the Declaration of Independence, or the Sermon on the Mount? If not, why contemptuously speak of them as "Mr. Sumner's negro theories?" It is possible that here is "*profanity*" in places not high, far more offensive to the God of the oppressed, than any word of Mr. Sumner, at which such solemn exception is taken. Such criticism abounded twenty years ago, before men learned that human beings are more sacred than books; and almost twenty hundred years since, before the world had heard "how much better is a man than a sheep!" and when "motes" in one pair of eyes were more invisible than "beams," or whole wood-piles, in another. Twenty years ago the great denominations were almost in bloody war on the modes of water baptism. They are not quite at peace yet. Some sects hold infant baptism a sacred ordinance. Others denounce it as an abomination. It was held that to pronounce the baptismal formula over an unconscious, perhaps sleeping babe, was "taking the name of God in vain;" "profanity in high places," our zealous young friends at the *Round Table* would term it. But all the great, popular sects held that infant *stealing*, robbing a hundred thousand mothers per annum of their new-born babes, and even keeping plantations stocked with mothers to breed infants for the shambles, as was done in Virginia especially, might be done with no impeachment of Christian character in deed or doctrine; or, as Rev. Dr. Fisk expressed it, "Without any violation of the Christian faith!"

Let the *Round Table* abate none of its zeal against "profanity in high places," in all places. But let it avoid that hateful Phariseeism which eighteen hundred years ago could abstain from swine's flesh but devour widow's houses, widows and all; and though straining at gnats in some things, could swallow down camels by the caravan, in thousands of others.

ENGLISH PIETY FOR THE POOR.—The *Christian Enquirer* says: "A great meeting has been held in Exeter Hall to oppose the opening of Museums and similar institutions on Sundays. At the close of the fourth lecture of the Sunday evening course for the people, the Chairman announced that the Lord's Day Observance Society had instituted proceedings against the course, and forbidden the Hall to be opened for the other lectures. The immense audience was enraged. It thus appears that in England it is legal to open ale-shops, but illegal to open lecture-rooms, legal to intoxicate people, but illegal to instruct them, on the Lord's Day; the Halls must be shut on Sunday, but the "Hells" must be kept open from Saturday night until Monday morning. The Lord's Day Society instituted no proceedings to pull the people out of the pit into which they have fallen; but when scientific professors reach down their hands to uplift fallen humanity, said Society sends a bailiff to shout "hands off," in the name of Him who said, "The Sabbath is made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."

In the same article we are told that "no students entered Manchester College last term, though that institution is under the management of Professors Martineau and Taylor, two of the ablest thinkers and best theological scholars in England. The reasons assigned for this falling off are, 1st, the smallness of the salaries paid to ministers; 2d, the comparatively diminished respect in which ministers, particularly of the dissenting sects, are held in English society." But there is an old account of one very able and excellent minister who actually became "*of no reputation;*" who even took, for some mysterious reason, "the form of a servant."

"KEEP COOL."—The Springfield *Republican* of Saturday counsels thus in the present shuddering crisis. Certainly coolness and calmness are always virtues as regulators of action. Never more so than in an hour like the present. But that so many "influential papers in the country" are willing to be "impartial spectators" of the present "conflict at the national capital," and are "advising the people to patient waiting" is as disgraceful to those journals, as it is dangerous to the safety of the nation.

This is a time for the sensible and patriotic men to keep cool. Let the storm of passion rage at Washington till it exhausts its fury; the country is safe so long as the people preserve their self-poise and look at public affairs with candor and an unpartisan spirit, holding in reserve the power to be exercised at the proper time in support of what is right and the correction of what is wrong, regardless of the selfish strifes of men and factions. It is an encouraging sign of the times, and shows that the popular pulse still beats regularly and firmly, that the most influential papers of the country stand in the attitude of impartial spectators of the conflict at the national capital, discussing the matters in issue fairly and advising the people to calmness and patient waiting for the subsidence of a storm which can be but temporary if the people let it alone. The Albany *Evening Journal*, commenting in this spirit on the veto and the unpleasant demonstrations it has provoked, says:

> "Again we counsel, as we have counseled heretofore, moderation and forbearance. The momentary impulse of those who do not agree with the President will be to judge him harshly and uncharitably. But he has claimed, and has a right to claim, the prerogative of differing with members of his party upon questions of policy. We can afford to look oppositions of opinion squarely in the face, and discuss them without passion. All the conditions of our case are new. We have no precedents to guide judgment or control action. We must feel our way carefully to results. It is not remarkable that Mr. Johnson, conscious at once of the magnitude of his responsibilities, and of the momentous consequences that impend upon his course, should hesitate at measures which involve an entire remodeling of our practice in government. In this emergency, we look with hope to Congress, for the display of a temper adequate to the needs of the hour."

A HINT.—The counsel of the following from the Portland *Advocate* is good. The grammar is indifferent. Our readers can, if they please, correct that and then read STANDARD instead of *Advocate*. A young fellow said the other day in our hearing, that it cost him two dollars a week for cigars. THE STANDARD would not cost him six cents a week. It would not soil his mouth, spoil his breath, debase his manners nor impair his health. But the *Advocate* has the floor:

> A subscriber of the Claremont *Eagle* says: "If those people who have to stop their paper these 'hard times,' would just leave off their tobacco and take the paper as he has done, they would find themselves much better off, and the times not near so hard."
>
> The *Advocate* adds: If every brother in the Baptist church in Maine, who pleads hard times for not taking the *Advocate*, but holds on to the "plug," would just leave off their tobacco, and take it, they would have a blessed experience, and then that list of new subscribers you would have, we cannot tell how long it would be.

NEW SUBSCRIBERS.—Every day now adds them to our list. Some of our friends have interested themselves to excellent purpose in procuring them. Two or three liberal clergymen have won our thanks for what they have done in their congregations and neighborhoods. Grateful for the past, we hope every effort made will be continued, and that new co-operators will spring up on every hand.

SUBSCRIBERS will please note the bills enclosed in their STANDARDS, and oblige us by promptly remitting the amount due.

HARMONIOUS.—The Republican press interludes a discord now and then, understood, however, as sound only, meaning nothing. For instance, the New York *Times* says of the *Tribune*:

> "The journal so long blatant for 'peace upon the best attainable terms,' says:
>
> 'New Hampshire holds her State election to-day. The recent utterances of Messrs. William H. Seward and Henry Ward Beecher form the principal electioneering stock of the Copperhead party. We hope.'
>
> "The best possible chance of success for our friends in New Hampshire and Connecticut rests upon the truly enlightened 'utterances' of the gentlemen thus assailed. Nor is it the first time States have been saved in critical circumstances by kindred 'utterances.' When madness and folly had the popular helm, a Maine election was saved by the acceptance of wiser counsels; while, in the same year, Connecticut was held to her Union anchor by inviting Greeley, Phillips, etc., to bestow their speeches elsewhere."

On Tuesday, New Hampshire relieved both of longer suspense by electing her Republican ticket, the majority being not far from 5,000.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.—The New York *Times* congratulates itself and friends on the New Hampshire election of Tuesday last on this wise:

> Yesterday the people of New-Hampshire reelected their Union Governor by a very handsome majority—considerably larger than that for Mr. Lincoln in 1864.
>
> This is the first State election since the assembling of Congress and the definitions of policy made by Mr. Johnson in his message and by the extreme Radicals through their spokesman, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens. It is the earliest opportunity that the people have had to express their confidence in the Government, and they have done it most emphatically.
>
> Is the *Times* sure the Granite State, in the re-election of Governor Smyth, has not declared for "*these extreme Radicals*," instead of against them? In his message to the Legislature last June, the Governor said very nobly, like any "radical:"
>
> "The question of negro suffrage is one of those defences behind which slavery will yet entrench itself, and by which it will seek to regain some fragment of the power it has justly lost. If we would have an enduring and prosperous peace, we shall level every obstruction, *concede nothing to the prejudices of slavery, and give the freedman the right to assert that manhood peacefully at the ballot-box, which he has so nobly proved on the battle-field.* Let no fears or apparent difficulties in the way deter us. There is no danger so great to a nation as the existence of a flagrant injustice in its midst, sanctioned and protected by its authority. Let us, therefore, be just, and hope for continued favor from the source of all prosperity."

REVIVALS.—The Springfield *Republican* is not alone now in publishing in its columns more or less of religious intelligence. For some reason large numbers of the political papers are doing the same thing. A young friend at our side thinks the piety of the *Republican* cannot be genuine, for in the column with thevery long list of Revivals reported, stand the two following rather Babylonish items:

> "The London *Spectator* makes a calculation that there are at least four millions of sermons delivered annually in Great Britain, and adds that all together they do not have the effect of a song by Tennyson or a speech by Gladstone. This is hardly a fair comparison. The preacher has to do rather with the heart than the intellect, with morals rather than esthetics."
>
> "A clergyman at Meriden, Ct., prayed, last Sunday: 'Not my will but thine, O Lord, be done; but if it be consistent with thy holy pleasure, we would that thou speedily telegraph for President Johnson to come up to heaven.'"

OUR WASHINTON LETTER.—Those who think its revelations startling, or sensational, can read in connection with it, the following from the Washington correspondent of the New York *Commercial* of Tuesday evening:

> "The President evidently feels that he is master of the situation, and he is terribly in earnest in his opposition to Congress, especially when he finds himself attacked as he was on Saturday by Mr. Stevens. He told a New England Congressman yesterday that Louisiana is now more loyal than she ever was, her large foreign population never having transferred the allegiance which they bore to France before the treaty of transfer; and that South Carolina is more loyal than she has been since the nullification fever began to break out. But he grimly intimated that other sections of the Union are not displaying much loyalty, *and that the next rebellion may be commenced in Massachusetts. There are those here who believe that we are yet to have a coup d'etat, which will admit the Southern members into Congress, and eject the most radical of the Northern Senators and Representatives.*"

THE Washington agent of the Freedmen's Savings Bank has made a statement from which it appears that the institution has received, within a year, over a million of dollars from the negroes of the country. During the month of February those of that city alone deposited over five thousand dollars. The bank has twenty-nine branches, most of them in Southern cities. Where are the bank books of the poor whites?

BOOK NOTICES.—Leonard Scott & Co. have sent us the *London Quarterly* for January, and *Blackwood* for February. The following is the table of contents of the former:—Livingstone's Zambesi and its Tributaries; Simon de Montfort, Earl of Liecester; Tennyson's Enoch Arden; M. Sainte-Beuve; Grote's Plato; Miss Berry's Memoirs; Palgrave's Arabia, Caricature and Grotesque in Literature and Art; the Coming Session. *Blackwood* for January, besides continuing its serials, has (at least) an able article entitled "What will Government do?" [the British] "A visit to the big trees" (of California); "Religio Spenseri;" General Lamoriciere; Stuart Mill on mind and matter; and Things in general.

SUBSCRIPTION FESTIVAL.—In the published report, Charles Richardson (paid five dollars) was accidentally omitted.

WE are indebted to Hon. CHARLES SUMNER for the latest Report of Agriculture, a rich granary of information on all that pertains to that important branch of human economy.

PERSONAL.

The papers say Senator Salisbury appeared in the Senate on Thursday of last week, in such a drunken condition that his friends had to remove him.

Hon. John Milton Earle, of Worcester, has made a donation of his large and valuable collection of marine shells, valued at several thousand dollars, to the Natural History Association of that city. The collection consists of many thousand individual specimens, and not less than from two to three thousand distinct species, many of them quite rare.

A drunken man was taken from a house of ill-fame to the lock-up in Washington, the other night, where upon him were found a roll of three thousand dollars and a paper showing that he was a Judge of a United States Court in a Western State. The awed policeman took him home.

The N. Y. *Tribune* says, among the papers left by the late Henry Winter Davis is a speech, in his own handwriting, in which he argues, with masterly ability, the necessity of granting unrestricted suffrage for all loyal men, both black and white, at the South. He claims there can be no encouragement for loyalty or peace to the country until the nation accepts this doctrine. The speech will soon be given to the public.

A Washington dispatch says that notwithstanding the fact that the Copperhead proprietors of several public halls refused to rent them for the lecture of Fred. Douglass, the members of the National Equal Suffrage Association were finally successful in their efforts to secure a commodious hall, and last night the distinguished colored orator referred to delivered his oration on "The Issues of the Day" before a large and appreciative audience. The Hon. Wm. D. Kelley of Pennsylvania, President of the Association, acted as chairman, and introduced the speaker in a brief, but highly complimentary address. Mr. Douglass, on coming forward, was greeted with long-continued applause.

Mrs. Lucretia Mott has recently visited New York and Brooklyn, and while here has addressed several large and deeply interested meetings in some of the Friends' meeting-houses in both cities. Few, if any, more able, certainly none more faithful ministers of that denomination can be found even among the young and the strong membership. It was our happiness to listen to her on the Sunday morning before last, and a more beautiful presentation of the doctrines and duties of the sermon on the Mount we never heard in any church, however high, or however low.

"LEGAL VOTERS."

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Times* writing from Richmond, Va., March 7th, says:

> "The women of the South are the only unconquered people in this section. A great majority of them are as rebellious as ever, and to their influence, as much as to anything else, is due the occasional disloyal demonstrations of their male associates. Oh, how they do hate Yankees! It would be delicious to see them turn up their noses at blue coats, to see them walk around the 'astral banner' instead of under it, and to see them encourage treasonable ebullitions of mob temper, if it were not for the fact that a sensible man is convinced that they are playing the parts of fools. It would be doing gross injustice to the fair sex here to include them all in the unconquered category, for there are many who are sensible enough to assist in soothing away the bitterness of defeat, and in attempting to reconcile matters. Mr. Beecher ought to take a trip down here before he commits himself much more on the subject of female suffrage. E. P. B."

If the Republicans should succeed in their proposed amendment of art. 1, sec. 2d of the Constitution, and make "legal voters" the basis of representation, the black man may be worse off than under the Constitution as it now is. The spirit of caste would impel Southern aristocrats to enfranchise their women sooner than their negroes. Their leading women would not hesitate to come down from the sublime heights assigned them in the ideal world, to cast a ballot for Southern ideas as opposed to those of Mudsills and Yankees, especially if the choice lay between the enfranchisement of themselves or their plantation slaves. For women are ever the most aristocratic and bigoted class in any community. From the false, irresponsible position which they hold in life, the narrow selfishness and vacuity which excessive ease and luxury always produce, they hate alike a government of equality, in which labor is dignified, and a religion of sacrifice, which lays on the rich and strong the burthens of the poor and helpless.

Beware, American Senators, lest in this backward legislation you are foiled in what you attempt. Pray, make no amendments to the Constitution that shall narrow its base. Until we are ready to establish justice, and form a more perfect Union than that of the Fathers, let us be divorced. God hath not joined equality and caste, liberty and slavery together, and we can never build a true republic on such foundations as these. If a century of civilization has not enabled us to take a higher step than the Fathers, let us at least not mar their work. E. C. S.

PROSPECTS OF THE SOUTHERN LABORER.

HILTON HEAD, S. C., March 4, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR: Public enlightenment determines public duties. Even the most benevolent and philanthropic need to be enlightened, or their munificence may do harm rather than good. I am not able, from my limited field of observation, to present a great array of facts or figures, but will try to contribute my mite. The condition of the Freedmen on this island and vicinity is far from satisfactory. Some have made no contract or arrangement for the year's labor, worthy of the name. Some work for monthly wages, a very lame system in past years. Some are trying to farm for themselves, having leased a few acres of land, generally poor; but they must fail, as they have heretotore, for want of capital, and suitable ideas of economy. They have not money, teams or implements. They have few or no provisions, or, in many cases, decent clothes. How, then, can they farm for themselves? They can only do so by getting necessaries on credit, and giving a lien on their crops, which experience has shown to be a wretched arrangement. For, by the time the money comes, or rather the settlement, the avails of the last pound of cotton have gone to meet the year's expenses.

The officers of the Freedmen's Bureau (Maj. M. R. Delaney being at the head of the office on this island) are making arrangements for such as will enter into them, to relieve the present want and destitution, and the distressing forebodings which many suffer under, and bring in, with diligence and prudence, a generous return at the end of the year.

The plan is, to work for the planters on the share system. I send you herewith a paper containing a form of Contract proposed by Maj. Delany, which, for its simplicity and the equity of its provisions to the parties concerned, meets the approbation of the authorities, planters and Freedmen. Each laborer, as soon as he sets foot upon a plantation, has a credit which brings him substantial food of good quality, and plain clothes, at cost, to be paid for at the end of the year, or when the crops are sold. Each family or individual has a pass-book, kept by himself, in which every charge is to be made, and no other charges will be recognized by the Bureau.

Each one has one-third of all he can produce, clear of all expenses except those incurred in the sale of the prepared staples. Every safeguard that can be thrown around the Freedmen's rights, will be secured. Although there is much more willingness to enter into contracts than there was six weeks ago, the demand is still far greater than the supply.

The planters, who come to the Bureau in considerable numbers, are apparently willing to conform to all the requirements. They are generally as poor as Job's cat. They wear (some of them) the tight pants made eight or ten years ago, and the overcoats made twenty or thirty years ago, with the single cape and standing collar. Some of them have gone to work themselves, and exhibit their hands, callous with hard knocks. One man, talking with a Freedman in our office, said to him, "I'll work for you if you will pay me. I'm not ashamed or afraid to work."

Many of the planters exhibit noble traits of character, and are grateful for the interest the Government takes, and the facilities it lends them in commencing their operations. True, slavery had its baleful influence over them; but now that that has passed away, they will be guided by better counsels, and mold their conduct accordingly. Their conduct, in comparison with some Northern Copperheads whom we have had here, is praiseworthy. The latter have come into the office, and walked past the colored Major's desk, to the desk of the white agent, saying, they didn't do business with a black man. Of course, the reptiles were not gratified in their *refined* tastes.

Gen. Scott, Asst. Commissioner, successor of Gen. Saxton, is an officer of generous impulses, and prompt in action, and if Gen. Saxton must be removed, a more judicious selection could not have been made. He has lately visited this and other places in the vicinity, and made a very favorable impression. He is a man of generous sympathies and fixedness of purpose, and the interests of the Freedmen will not suffer in his hands. The Department also, is fortunate in its present Commander, Maj.-Gen. D. E. Sickles. He has taken strong ground in favor of justice and right; and while he grants every reasonable facility to the late rebels, to help them to resume their agricultural and mercantile operations, and thus repair their ruined fortunes; and while he welcomes and encourages any signs of returning loyalty, he still visits with more than his severest scorn, any attempt to take advantage of the Freedmen, by driving them from their homes, robbing them of their earnings, or compelling them to work for one-third or one-half of what they ought to receive.

As an example, he has lately required the laborers on the plantations about Columbia, where they were getting but four or five dollars a month, to remove to places nearer the seaboard, where labor meets with something like its due reward.

He has his General and Sub-Military Inspectors, whom he requires to note all irregularities and report them promptly to him. So injustice is meeting its due reward.

Some planters not very far from here, who had driven the people from their plantations and stolen their little crops, are now trying to get those same people to come back and work; but though they offer the "labor-brokers" four or five dollars apiece for hands, they can't fill their complements. Having trampled on their rights when they should have befriended them, they are now reaping the reward of their crime and folly. Thus is exemplified the thought, that though the mills of God grind slowly, they grind exceeding small. As a man soweth so shall he reap.

I have said that some of the planters were exhibiting commendable traits. They may act from unworthy motives, but their rebellious feelings are giving way. They accept the situation. They expect strong measures from the Government. They are prepared for them. They know that the Government, if it has any self-respect, will put them forth. They may weep while they hang their secession harps upon the willows, but they are tired of turmoil. They want peace, they want rest, they want cash, and a portion of their former comforts. They can have them by loyalty and industry. Will they bestow them?

It is curious to see the conflicting emotions of some whom we meet. They cherish all their former affection for the leaders of the rebellion, and yet make a fair show of loyalty. One man said he would as soon hang Washington as Jefferson Davis, and yet, before he left the office, cheered the old stars and stripes enthusiastically.

There are others farther inland who retain all their murderous hate and revenge, and the mean, despicable course of the President does not tend to soften such feelings. But, thanks to the noble band in Congress, and the noble band out of Congress, all is not yet lost.

J. W. P.

"OURSELVES AND OUR RELATIONS."

BAYARD TAYLOR, of this city, on the 6th inst., lectured in Brooklyn, on the above subject as advertised, but really on the working of our political and social institutions, contrasted with those of other nations.

The discourse commenced with a descriptive comparison between some prominent features of European and American life, illustrating the results of the two systems of government, as they affect the comfort of life and the security of person and property. Although the speaker confined himself to giving facts—"leaving hearers to draw their own inferences"—still the European side of the picture had rather more than its share of sunshine; being drawn from what might be named a "society" stand-point, thus representing truly the condition of the upper classes, and with equal fidelity ignoring that of the "masses." It was in this respect not unlike the old-time reports of well-intentioned Northern observers about the South, who made most of their researches through the window-panes of hospitable slaveholders' mansions. On the whole, Mr. T. seemed by no means to think that "we are governed too much."

After dwelling a little on our great deference, in social matters, to "public opinion"—so-called—the speaker said that our Republic has made no political progress since its birth—while European nations have—and that it is now far from being a true democracy. In support of this statement, the principle of "majority rule" and direct and uniform popular representation was set up as the standard; and the anomalies of State representation (in the U. S. Senate), of representation based on population instead of number of voters, and of State instead of national qualifications for suffrage, were strongly denounced. The immense power lodged in the Executive was also deprecated, and the State-rights principle represented as identical in its nature with the European principle of aristocracy. Thus, without mentioning the disfranchised race, Mr. T. evidently wished such ground taken, on general principles, as would insure to them the rights of manhood.

After a passage on the "danger of intrusting ignorance with political power," in which our large immigration was said to have "come near being our political ruin," and in which the "reading test" for voters and the German system of compulsory school attendance were called for, the lecture closed with an earnest exhortation to abandon all excessive veneration for political maxims and systems, respectable in their origin, but no longer applicable to the circumstances, and to move on with the world—building a firmer and freer Union as we go.

The manner of the speaker was more unimpassioned and deliberate even than is his wont—reminding one almost of Gerrit Smith. He addressed himself to the understanding of his hearers—not to their feelings. This, and the almost painfully *studied* absence of all controversial phrases and of all direct allusions to the question of the day, were apparently intentional, the orator being evidently desirous to say the truth "in full," but being restricted by the circumstances of the case. Considering the (hardly too radical) political character of the institution under whose auspices the discourse was held, as well as of the audience, his course was prudent as it was difficult. Probably the seed fell deeper in the untilled ground thus, than by "strong talk."

Our friend T. has yet some "conservative" earmarks about him; but we rejoice to see him as far advanced as he is, and are hopeful of the future.

LETTER FROM THE FIELD.

OLEAN, CATTARAUGUS Co., N. Y., March 1st, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

"For the strength of the hills we bless Thee!" This, the oldest settled town of the county has been built by its lumber trade of the last sixty years. For two generations, the tall pines borne up on these stout hill sides, have come crashing and thundering to the ground, under the woodman's axe, to be rafted down the Alleghany and the Ohio for the use of Pittsburg, Cincinnati and other towns growing up along the banks of these rivers.

The lumbermen of Cattaraugus may have had a life of as hardy and bold adventure as those of Maine and New Hampshire, and as much keen enjoyment out of it; but they have lacked the good fortune of a poet neighbor to sing to the world for them, as Whittier has done for the New England lumbermen.

Olean 'Point' was for thirty or forty years the principal depot of Western emigration for this and the Eastern States. Families embarked here, with all their goods and farming implements, usually at the time of the spring floods, when the melting snows had swollen the Alleghany, and in a sort of dreamy, stately leisure on the great rafts of pine boards, made their way at the flowing pace of the "pleasant river" (as the Indian name Alleghany means), through the many leagues of forest, meadow and mountain scenery of Pennsylvania, or that lay along on either side of the La Belle Rivière, as the French called the beautiful Ohio.

This primitive travel had its fascinations, as people tell; the musical ripple of the water as the raft glided along under the stars at night, the broad sunshine by day, the fresh, spring air, fragrant with the wholesome balsamic scent of the new boards; glimpses of the graceful, bounding deer in the hemlock woods, the wonderful flight of the wild pigeons; that most astonishing spectacle in animated nature. No pen that I know of has begun to adequately describe it, or we should have a sketch as brilliant and powerful as N. P. Rogers has left of the marvel of Ailsa Craig sea-fowl.

But what THE STANDARD has to do with Olean, to-day, is, to record its service to the claims of black men to equal rights. The Baptist church gave cordial welcome to Miss Holley's earnest plea in this cause Sunday afternoon. With full, noble sympathy, the minister, Rev. Dexter Morris, announced the lecture in the morning, repeating with emphasis "*Justice* to the *Freedmen.*" "What a great thought there is in these words!" he said, as he urged all his congregation to listen to the lecture, as he should not fail to do. That the colored man must vote, is so clearly just, that an old Democrat" (as he styled himself) said to us afterward, "Now you've freed him, he must vote!" "A man is not a man unless he can vote," he added, as his wife subscribed for THE STANDARD, "and your Anti-Slavery Society has got a greater work on its hands than it ever had before." It reminded us of Mr. Charles Sumner's estimate that the work is but half done.

Portville also makes its living and its fortunes from the pine trees. Through the aid and sympathy of Mr. John Merscreau, a merchant lumberman, the Presbyterian church in Portville was opened (both this year and last) on Sunday afternoon to Miss Holley's lecture. The Presbyterian minister read the notice in the morning, but took occasion to say in his sermon, that Paul forbade women to speak in public, in the churches. It was the first time since the Slaveholder's Rebellion we have met this objection to woman's pleading for the outraged and cruelly wronged black people in this country. This minister has evidently overlooked Paul's explicit directions, how a woman should appear when she teaches in public, and so, does not only great injustice to the bravest and noblest apostle of early Christian truth, but to the advancing spirit of the age, every where welcoming woman as never before, in every good *word* and work.

At Randolph, Mrs. Asahel Crowley, warmly welcomed us as in former years to her pleasant hospitality. The earnest young Methodist minister and his wife rejoiced in the good meeting Miss Holley held in their church.

Our route was through Salamanca, the wilderness entrepot to the Atlantic and Great Western Railway—in the Indian town of Buckteeth. A party of Aborigines came on board the train. The women all wore long dresses and crinoline, shoes, and green veils over their heads. It may be evidence of progress and civilization, but they were not half so picturesque and interesting as they used to be in their Indian bloomer suits of dark blue broadcloth, beaded moccasins and blankets. One of those Senecas, a little boy, couldn't be moved to the slightest curiosity at a picture of The Pied Piper and the Rats; but we were pleased to see the stoic mask lift a little, and the faintest ghost of a smile flit across his face as he held out his hand for some peppermint drops Miss H. offered him.

Otto lies amid the wild, broken scenery of the Cataraugus Creek, in the North of this great county. Mr. and Mrs. C. B. Allen, old readers of THE STANDARD, reside here, and we esteemed ourselves happy in making their agreeable acquaintance. Miss Holley spoke in the Congregational church, and their appreciation and sympathy were a rare refreshment. Their pastor was at the great meeting of colored people in Nashville, and heard Andrew Johnson make his promise to be their Moses. He, with almost every one we meet, is filled with regret and indignation at President Johnson's shameful betrayal of the best hopes of loyal people.

We saw a little Virginia contraband boy so happy in this his first Winter out of slavery. His face shone with joy. Our friend heard him one day summing up to himself the sweets of Freedom, as he rocked away all alone in her kitchen. "When I was down South, wouldn't I have had to take it over the head if I was rocking this way in the house?" C. F. P.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

EXTRACT of a private letter, dated Charleston, S. C., March 4, 1866.

AFTER the great loss of Gen. Saxton, I think the freedmen are fortunate in the new Commissioner, Gen. Scott. He wears the harness like a veteran warrior; administering justice with even hand, and apparently without fear or favor. We already begin to experience the ill effects of the veto. Rebels are jubilant; the Southern press is extra impudent; weak-kneed military men are becoming still more conservative; civil officials are already brushing the dust and cobwebs from their sanctums; members elect to Congress are trying to gather greenbacks sufficient to carry them to Washington; and altogether the rod of power seems within the very grasp of these poor, deluded aspirants for that which is lost to them forever.

But neither the freedmen or their friends are greatly disheartened. They have more cause to pity than to fear. The black man sees that the white man depends more upon him than he upon the white man. Two months since, the white man was beseeching U. S. soldiers to drive the black man from his estate; and many are the bayonet-thrusts, and bullet-wounds which attest to the readiness with which such entreaties were answered. To-day, white men are offering agents of the Bureau, and intelligent freedmen, five dollars bounty for every able-bodied contraband who can be induced to go back under a fair contract; but with very indifferent success. Although as a general thing, the freedmen are ready and willing to work, still from *ignorance*, or some *mysterious* cause, they are becoming wonderfully fastidious as to the rice swamp to which they are invited, and who may be the proprietor of it. But few of the planters have means to raise a crop, even if they could obtain laborers. In view of this exigency, the Government had made all necessary arrangements to furnish them supplies, and take a lien upon their crops. But from some unaccountable cause, at any rate, after the "veto," and after a certain declaration of sentiments, by a certain "man," from a certain house in Washington, these arrangements were all countermanded; and now, desolation and completion of ruin seem almost inevitable. Who can tell to what terrible straits this unfortunately defiant people are doomed? God is just; and that is what they have the greatest reason to dread. This desperate haste for reconstruction, this miserable, uncalled-for Executive clemency, have expedited the certain ruin of this people. One single year of healthful, earnest discipline would have revealed to them their true character and position, and would have made them humbler, more loyal citizens. Now they are bold and defiant, and must abide the crushing results of their recklessness. No human power can stay them.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

SHAKSPEARE tells us, in his "Titus Andronicus," of the king's daughter being seized by rude men who cut out her tongue, cut off her hands, and then mockingly bade her "go call for water and wash your hands."

Not more cruel were those Goths, than our Saxon rulers, who, after disfranchising all negroes and women, now propose to so amend the Constitution that only those who do vote shall be counted in the basis of representation.

For three months Congress has been trying to amend Art. 1st, Sec. 2d of the Constitution, and yet the joint resolutions now before the Senate are no better than those in the beginning. Verily, the last state of these men is worse than the first. Not one of the amendments proposed this Winter would improve that article, as it came from the Fathers, one iota.

One turns with sadness from the recent able and eloquent speeches of the Massachusetts Senator with their classic beauty, religious earnestness and profound logic, to that compromising resolution of to-day, and regrets that once more the *man* is buried in the politician. It was to be hoped the New York *Times*, at no distant day, would be compelled to give Charles Sumner of the United States Senate, for his faithfulness to principle, a place beside John Stuart Mill of the British Parliament. But to whom shall we look now?

Some of our Senators have had the grace to propose to make the *amende honorable* by releasing those from taxation who are not represented; but as this would be a most expensive piece of gallantry for the public treasury, the disfranchised would not press its consideration. Women and negroes have proved them

Our Boston Correspondence.

BOSTON, March 12th, 1866.

THOSE members of the periodical press in this State that formerly took the side of slavery, and used all their powers of sophistry and calumny against the Abolitionists, are now either openly rejoicing in the division between Mr. Sumner and Mr. Wilson, or actively taking part with the latter against the former. Facts like this are a part of the evidence (and there is much more of the same sort) that the change brought about in the Northern people as well as the Southern by the events of the last four years, has been a change of policy rather than a change of heart. The Southern people gave up slavery only when, and only because, it was wrenched from them by the strong hand of war. The Northern people discontinued their support of slavery only when, and only because, a change of position on that subject became indispensable to the overthrow of the rebellion. On neither side was there either repentance for sin, or a practical turning to righteousness. Both have adopted right measures, to a certain extent, but neither has chosen this course *because* it was right. North and South agree in accepting the Constitution Amendment which allows slavery only so far as it is a legal penalty for crime. This is vastly better than the view of that subject taken by Law and Constitution five years ago, and in this improvement we heartily rejoice. But before we recognize this change as a *conversion* of the people of the United States to a determined preference of right over wrong, of justice over oppression, of equal rights for all instead of caste and class legislation, we shall do well to recognize the fact that North as well as South seems bent upon establishing here "a white men's government."

Mr. Buchanan expressed decided disapprobation of the treasonable action of the rebels in the last year of his Presidency. He was very sure that they were in the wrong, and that the nation had certain rights in opposition to them; only—virtuous, conscientious man!—he could find no precise description in the Constitution of a method for enforcing those rights. So he let the nation go to ruin, sat still, serenely witnessing the destruction of its rights, interests and honor, gave the important aid of his inaction to its worst enemies, and then wrote a book to show that he had kept the Constitution inviolate, as if it were plain that the Constitution is of more importance than the nation.

Mr. Wilson stands, morally, on a very different plane from Mr. Buchanan. The latter has placed himself conspicuously on the roll of infamy, having used the noblest opportunities in the worst possible manner, and practised a treachery baser than that of Arnold, without the poor excuse of temptations such as Arnold's. In Buchanan there was baseness enormous and unspeakable without a single counterbalancing virtue. Mr. Wilson, on the contrary, has many merits, and has on many occasions deserved well of his State and his country. But is he not, in the trying emergency now before us, taking Mr. Buchanan's ground of deference to the Constitution rather than the nation? Is he not assuming that the nation must be allowed to suffer, if thus only it can be proved that the Constitution receive no detriment? Is he not opposing a measure called for alike by justice and expediency as indispensable to the public welfare, and this only because the Constitution does not provide for it?

One of those unconverted leaders of the political press of whom I have spoken above has just published an article in defence of the ground taken by Mr. Wilson, in the course of which the following sentiment is expressed, a due consideration of which would have turned his article in the opposite direction. After urging exact adherence to the Constitution, this editor says—"If, indeed, we are yet substantially in a state of war, negro suffrage may be ordered by the Government in virtue of the powers inherent in it for its own defence."

Precisely so! And that we *are* yet substantially in a state of war, that we have yet to deal with rebels and enemies in the Southern country, that the theories, and ideas, and wishes which gave rise to the rebellion yet reign predominant in the hearts of the Southern people, and may be expected to break out into open manifestation as soon as the power of self-government is again committed to their hands, are truths which flame out upon us from every day's bulletins from the whole region south of Mason and Dixon's line, unmistakable, portentous, full of forebodings of yet coming calamity, unless the remedy be applied in time. The following extracts from the Washington correspondence of a paper of this very day, being fair specimens of *every* day's intelligence from the rebel region, ought to show us that we are *yet*, substantially, on a war footing:

"The character of the presidential supporters in Washington is to some extent indicated by the resolutions adopted at a meeting of them, held last evening in the City Hall. They express great delight at his veto of the odious black law recently passed by the radicals in Congress; they demand that the Maryland registry law, which prevents returned rebels from voting, shall be speedily abolished, holding it 'unwarranted and in the highest degree oppressive;' they welcome with open arms all our erring brethren, and claim for them all the civil, religious and political privileges in which we ourselves participate; and finally they say there is no longer any necessity for the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, and declare that all citizens now immured in forts and dungeons should no longer be restrained of their liberty, but should be fully accorded all the benefits of the freedom of American citizens."

"The official report, for the month of February, of the Commissioner of Freedmen for Arkansas, presents some important facts respecting the condition of affairs in that State. He says that public sentiment has not improved of late, and that intolerance and proscription of Union men are more open and fierce than it was last Fall."

These, I say, are fair specimens of the state of things existing in the minds of a large majority of the Southern whites. Such feelings and purposes are our sufficient warrant for the expectation of perpetual and effective interference with the only process that can make us a homogeneous and prosperous nation, the rooting of free institutions in the Southern soil, unless measures be taken to *prevent* such interference. The commencement of this experiment, and the first years of its trial, must be efficiently protected by the power of the United States; and to this end, the criminals who have lately fallen into the hands of the nation should be held in the strong grasp of power until a new population of loyalists shall have entered upon, and become accustomed to, the exercise of political power. While this exigency lasts, Congress is greater than the Constitution, and must act independently of it; just as, while the rebel armies held the field, the President was greater than the Constitution, overrode its provisions in various directions, held its letter to be subordinate to the nation's welfare, and was upheld by the wise, the good and the loyal in so doing. He who now claims that deference for the letter of the Constitution should restrain us from taking such preventive measures as the nation's safety, and the safety of its black population demand, is taking a dangerous course, is entering upon a suspicious line of policy, is placing himself beside most disreputable associates.

The framers of the Constitution provided, to the best of their ability, against certain dangers which they saw to be impending. But the possibility of a rebellion such as we have just experienced was something that they did *not* see, and did not attempt to provide against. Are we, therefore, to lie down and die without a struggle, merely because our disease is not described in their books? The melancholy truth is, that our allegiance to freedom, our recognition of the fundamental principles, our sense of the necessity of resisting the beginnings of evil, and our vigor in seizing the right moment for action, are not answerable to those of our fathers. What chapter and verse authorized them to banish the Stamp Commissioners, and to throw the tea into Boston harbor? The difference between them and us is, that they understood the necessities of a revolution, and that we do not.

Mr. Seward, as was to be expected, persists in upholding the policy of Andrew Johnson. In reply to the remonstrances of a member of Congress from Pennsylvania, he declared with warmth, not only that the policy of the Administration was his own, but that there is no further need of making distinction between rebels and loyal men. "There is not now," said he, "a rebel in the Republic, and the word should not be used."

Sad as is the confession, it seems as if our brief hope was now in the continuance of such exhibitions of presumptuous arrogance as the Southern rebels have been accustomed to make. The sight of them in Washington demanding "their rights" as voters, legislators, managers of the affairs of the nation, candidates for its posts of honor and profit, and natural superiors of all members of the race which they have hitherto held in slavery is enough, one would think, to warn all who see them of the danger of indiscriminate amnesty. But is it possible that impudent avowals such as these people make of their intentions in the future—and that speeches like the President's and letters like those of Mr. Seward and Thurlow Weed—can be spread broadcast by the daily press among the people without awakening them to their danger, and arousing a feeling the expression of which shall stimulate Congress to the performance of its duty? If ever there was need of plainly declaring to Senators and Representatives what the people think respecting their duty and the nation's safety, this is the hour when such manifestation should be made. And especially should we not leave unsupported those who, like CHARLES SUMNER, are standing in the forefront of the hottest battle, and bearing the brunt of our contest.

NORTH.

Our Washington Correspondence.

WASHINGTON, 12th March, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR: The Fenian fever rages. Ireland, too, doubtless might be free. There can be no solid reason why so fair a land should exist only as a jewel in the ring of a sovereign lady, which circles the world, and on which it is boastfully claimed "the sun never sets." But may I give your readers some reasons why many persons, here and elsewhere, are afraid the Fenians have other objects in view in connection with some of the heads of our own government, than the redemption of Ireland from British rule?

'Tis a significant fact that the appeals for Ireland and the outcry against England's oppression, happen just when our own country is most in danger, and when the executive branch of the government of which this Brotherhood is an avowed ally, is threatening by military force, the loyal portion of our Congress.

The history of this sudden uprising and organization with reference to the liberty of Ireland, is rather singular.

What was the meaning of the authorized visit of Archbishop Hughes to Rome in behalf of this government, the first year of the war? Who went away a professed friend of the Union and Free Government, and returned a neutral?

And would it not be well for the country to inquire of the Secretary of State what special official duty, certain other unappointed ambassadors performed in France and Rome, and why the Mexican scheme and the Fenian organization so soon followed? And to press the inquiry still further, why the *ruse* of a war with France was invented by the Prime Minister of the Executive, to cover the absolute promises of neutrality which he long since gave to the Emperor of the French, and now, why the Fenians are allowed to organize, drill, and arm themselves under the pretence of a war with England? "None so blind as those who will not see," and our startled nation will one day wake to the consciousness of that splendid Foreign Policy of our government, which has permitted the overthrow of an independent nationality on this side of the continent—pledged itself to neutrality in the same, opening wide the doors of our nation's sacred temples for the entrance of a Theocratic Monarchy! Let us be warned in time, for Lucifer himself could not have planned or executed a more subtle design against the throne of God than has this disappointed aspirant for Presidential honors (who sits behind the executive throne, but is greater than the throne itself) against the liberties of the American people. Significant signs of these things are—the frequent conferences that the ex-Gen. McClellan is at this time, and has been during the last year, holding personally and by dispatches with the Pope of Rome and the Emperor Napoleon—the mission of Thurlow Weed ostensibly to England—the re-installment of Gen. Sweeney who was dismissed the United States service by Secretary Stanton, and has lately been re-instated by the President through the influence of the Prime Minister—the repeated suppression by the government of all sympathy manifested by our troops on the Rio Grande, for the Liberal cause—the late visit of Mr. Seward to Southern Catholic powers—the present bitter opposition of the Executive and his adherents to the new Mexican loan—the utter and complete silence manifested by the government in relation to the late pretended demonstration of the Fenians upon Canada, and the speech made in this city but a few days since by "the head centre" of the order in which he stated, as reported in the Washington *Star*, "that the first blow was to be struck in Washington."

These facts, with other evidence which will shortly appear, will establish the truth of what we claim (if indeed the action of President Johnson himself in calling them to his aid, in his conflict with Congress, does not sooner burst the bubble), that this organization has not at any time been intended to operate against England, either by way of Canada or Ireland; but on the contrary, that through the manipulation of the Mephistopheles of the Administration, it is the armed hand of Papal Power, thrust into the affairs of this government, with the aim of the ultimate establishment of a Papal Dynasty upon the ruins of Americas' Republic:

THE PRESIDENT'S LAST HARANGUES

are the most deliberate and "menacing" declarations that have yet emanated from his lips, and indeed are more significant of "the coming conflict" than "the Grover Theatre mob" drivellings. To the Maryland delegation he says: "That his policy is before the country, and is not the result of impulse, or one adopted *ad captandum*. That it is the result of reflection and conviction, of his sincere convictions. That it is before the country, and as such it will continue to be, without being swerved from on his part in any particular. That there will be no abandonment of, or shrinking from, that policy." And again he repeats the monstrosity and the falsehood," that a part of the same spirit that animated the Rebellion at one end of the line, now exists at the other. That while one party was for breaking up the Union in the interests of slavery, the other party were willing to break it up to abolish slavery. The extremists agreed upon one thing, and so far as the desire for the dissolution of the Union was concerned, one was as culpable as the other. This policy is, as was the other, destructive of the government and he was equally opposed to both."

In connection with this, the language uttered by Garrett Davis (who is now considered one of the President's mouthpieces), in his speech last week in the United States Senate upon the concurrent resolutions:

"That the Southern Senators, and those who were in favor of securing them seats in the Senate, constituted a majority of the whole number of Senators. If these two were united, the President could communicate with them as the constitutional body; and, by the Eternal he would advise him to do it to-morrow. He would be clearly right in doing so. He would sooner trust the Southern Senators as the friends of the country than those who were for keeping them out. The President has the remedy in his hand, and ought to use it. There was no plainer principle of law than that the President would have the right, in case the Southern Senators came here and went into session with those who were in favor of admitting them, to decide whether it was or was not the constitutional Senate."

To the Kentucky delegation he says—(and this is still more significant as it comes after the report of the Reconstruction Committee upon the admission of Tennessee, which report takes direct issue with the President's plan of Reconstruction,)

"The present is regarded as a most critical juncture in the affairs of the nation, scarcely less so, than when an armed and organized force sought to overthrow the Government. To attack and attempt the disruption of the Government by armed combination and military force is no more dangerous to the life of the nation, than an attempt to revolutionize and undermine it by a disregard and destruction of the safeguards thrown around the liberties of the people in the Constitution. Our stand has been taken; our course has been marked out; we shall take no step backward in this matter. No other or higher evidence of our purpose in this regard can be given, than has already been furnished. In the future as in the past, we shall endeavor in good faith to make the administration of the affairs of the government conform to the Constitution in its letter and spirit. It is hoped by an adherance to this rule to remedy, ere long, all the irregularities and annoyances to which the people have been subjected."

The assembling of four additional regiments of "the Regulars" just at this time in Washington, is another significant fact. And just here it may be well to determine, where "the army" stand on this issue. Illustrative of this was a conversation related to me a few days since, by Robert Purvis, Esq., which occurred between himself and a soldier in the Senate gallery during the eloquent and able speech of Senator Nye upon "the concurrent resolutions."

The soldier said, "He (meaning Nye) had better stick to his party, or else, by God, his head'll come off."

Purvis says—"You talk loud—what do you mean?"

Soldier—"The bayonets are with the President."

Purvis—"The people are with Congress."

Soldier—"But the President and the bayonets can overpower the people."

Purvis—"The people will rise and take your bayonets from you."

Soldier—"That will bring on war, then."

Purvis—"Then let it come."

This coincides with the generally expressed sentiment of the army, and shows, as is understood here, that the Regular army will sustain the President.

In connection herewith, it may be well to state that organized bands of Confederate soldiers and secession sympathisers prowl around the streets at night, dogging Radical members of Congress, and threatening openly, that in thirty days every d—d Abolitionist and traitor (as they are now called) will be cleaned out of Washington."

These are not sensational statements, but facts which are this hour in existence, and taken together with other evidence that might be added, if time or space permitted, prove most conclusively that Andrew Johnson means war, and that to the hilt, unless Congress complies with his demands—and that ere the Northern people are aware of his intentions the *coup d'etat* will be consummated—the Southern States in the Union, Southern Representatives and Senators recognised as the legitimate Congress and Northern Radical Traitors, suppressed at the point of the bayonet.

VIATOR.

Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, March 11, 1866.

To the Editor of the Standard:

THE fifth lecture of the Course by the Association of colored people was delivered by Professor Wm. Howard Day. This eloquent speaker is a stranger to Philadelphia, but few among the audience having had the pleasure of hearing him prior to Thursday evening. His address was listened to with unbroken attention by his numerous hearers, who must have become wearied by its great length but for the general interest felt in the topics so forcibly presented, and the sympathizing zeal awakened by his earnest and impressive manner. The position, the needs, and the claims of the colored people; their wrongs, trials and sufferings; the oppression they endure; the injustice of which they are the victims; the many disabilities that everywhere torment them, and the multiplied proscriptions which power, prejudice and wickedness have always inflicted upon them, were conspicuously brought before our moral vision by this advocate of their sacred rights. Surely, the wants and claims of this long-suffering people cannot be too frequently or ardently announced. Their trials and oppressions no tongue can too loudly herald. The injuries they suffer, and the continual disabilities that sadly beset them on every hand, cannot be too often brought before our notice, to thrill us with sympathy, and quicken an active response in their behalf. And the harsh proscriptions that eclipse their pathway of life, infringe upon their liberties, and intercept their free pursuit of happiness, can never fall with exaggerated breath upon our ears, or be reiterated with a fervor that can too fully intensify our sense of justice, and our consciousness of the wrong done to this aggrieved race.

Professor Day's lecture was an elaborate appeal in behalf of universal justice. The operations of an adverse spirit were variously shown, by the citation of isolated cases and a review of general results. He desired that every man in the nation should be guaranteed civil and political privileges before the law, supporting the claim by quoting from the Constitution of the United States, which declares in favor of a Republican form of government for every State, and from the Declaration of Independence, which holds that all men are created equal, and endowed by rights which cannot justly be taken away. Suffrage he considered one of the blessings of that liberty which the Constitution was framed to guarantee. He thought Congress ought to sweep away the invidious distinctions made by State laws, in obedience to the supreme law of the land. The voices of the heroes of all ages, he remarked, mingled into one in support of manhood and justice. The seven years' war was waged for the rights, not of a single class, but of human nature at large. The triumph of American liberty was based upon those principles which had been trampled under foot by the despotism of ages. But scarcely had those principles begun to be incorporated into law, before slavery defiantly presented its demands—slavery, the perpetual rebel, always rebelling against just principles—and her arrogant and persistent voice was heeded. Then was ushered in the conflict between Freedom and its franchises, and Slavery with its proscriptions. In many a battle involving these principles of justice slavery was victorious. Let us now hope that the struggle is ended, the bloody part of it at least, by the downfall of slavery.

The speaker enumerated the prominent enactments that were passed in the interests of slavery, aiming to blast every hope of liberty, and showing how successfully the propagandists of this evil power bent the free States of the Union to their will. Many iniquitous laws of certain Northern States were mentioned, springing from the influence of slavery, and aiming to keep the colored people beneath the feet of power. The glaring injustice of these wretched and inexcusable laws was depicted, and instances of individual suffering and outrage imposed thereby were named, some of which betrayed a cruelty and heartlessness of oppression that harrowed the soul with pain. Verily, men must look with shame upon these laws, so mean, so disastrous to the welfare of a feeble race, so adverse to all that is just, generous and humane, and, conscious of the guilt that gave them existence, one would suppose they would lose no time, and spare no pains to blot out forever them and all their kindred, and strive to make amends for their long course of tyranny, by the most assiduous efforts to establish justice for all people of color.

The lecturer spoke of that villainous spirit still alive in the South, whose latest demonstrations were made against the colored schools and school-houses. He intimated that these and similar manifestations of antipathy and hate would force the colored man to go armed with deadly weapons for personal security. Should a conflict ensue eventually, he asked—who would be responsible?

Mr. Day strongly urged that, inasmuch as slavery has been abolished, the proscriptions which grew out of it should be forever banished. There should be loyalty not only to government, but likewise true loyalty to liberty. They should be made synonymous. He would prefer some monarchy, some autocracy to a Republican despotism, which invades and destroys the rights of millions. There should be an advancement to the true Democratic faith, which accords full human rights to every human being. The ballot is peculiarly the American weapon, and no American is fully armed until he has it to protect him in his liberty and rights.

He spoke at considerable length and with much earnestness with reference to the colored soldiers, their bravery, sacrifices and faithfulness, and insisted with great warmth upon the proper recognition of their services by the Government, declaring that they should be granted full equality before the law if from no other motive than simple gratitude.

Other topics of a nature kindred to those mentioned in this brief report were treated upon, and the position of the speaker in relation to them was sustained by argument, confirmed by facts, enforced by copious illustration, and fortified by abundant evidence gleaned from historic record.

O.

INSPIRATION—BLIND TOM.—Let those who say that inspiration ceased some eighteen hundred years ago, go and see and hear Blind Tom, the musical wonder of his age. Hear him play the most difficult pieces of music, in a style and manner which surpass Thalberg, Heller or Gottschalk; hear him play one tune with his right hand, another with his left, and sing a third all at the same time, and then come back and tell us that there is no inspiration. This blind slave boy, one of the lowest specimens in the scale of humanity, who can neither read nor write—has no knowledge of music, and in all other respects is nearly idiotic, performs on the piano in a style of beauty and perfection which the most eminent artists may envy. Thousands of people crowd to hear him—say it is wonderful or strange, or pass it over in some other slighting way, and yet sit with their eyes shut to a natural and simple solution of the matter. We know that this boy is a medium, and that Beethoven is the performer. Thus the spirit of the great master is operating through the organization of this poor negro boy—giving unsurpassed melody to the world.

We confess that it does sometimes astonish us to see hundreds and thousands of intelligent, educated people, standing out in the broad light of heaven's natural philosophy, and yet groping back in the dark ages of the world's history, only to find that inspiration ceased eighteen hundred years ago. God help them.—*Chicago Philosophical Journal.*

CONGRESS.

ITS ways are past finding out. On Saturday the senate had no session. The House as good as none. Mr. Stephens, of Pennsylvania, made a speech intended, so his friends say, only as a joke on the President. He denied point blank that the President ever made the speech attributed to him on the 22d last month. But the New York *World* says very seriously: "What passes in Washington for a joke too grotesque for anything but derisive laughter, is meant to be circulated in the rural districts of Pennsylvania as a denial of the genuineness of President Johnson's scathing speech."

And further the *World* adds:

"This ridiculous exhibition, which passed in the House for an accidental and purely impromptu interlude in the midst of a written speech, had been prepared with deliberate art, and carefully conned and rehearsed. The delivery of a written speech was a part of the artifice. Stevens pretended that the speech was committed to paper some time ago, and that he had been long waiting for an opportunity to read it. * * * * By thus passing it off as an unpremeditated and grotesquely diverting joke in Washington, it could be sent without suspicion to the back counties of Pennsylvania, where it is to be used for impudent deceptions."

In any event at such a time as this, it might be said of the speech, as Daniel Webster said of the nomination of Gen. Taylor, "*it were not fit to be made.*" Jokes should ever have some respect to time, place and subject.

On Monday the Senate hastened together and proposed three more new amendments to the Constitution. Evidently the Constitution is in a bad way if any of these are substantial Amendments. Senator Wilson, of Massachusetts, proposed the following:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to the number of male citizens over 21 years of age, having the qualifications required for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature, excluding citizens possessing like qualifications disfranchised for participation in any rebellion, and persons of like age not naturalized. The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every 100,000 of actual population; but each State shall have at least one Representative."

Mr. Grimes, of Iowa, then said he believed his time had come to offer a Constitutional Amendment, and he therefore offered the following:

"Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, including Indians not taxed. But whenever in any State the elective franchise shall be denied to any portion of the male citizens above the age of 21 years, except for crime or disloyalty, the basis of representation in such State shall be reduced in the proportion of the number of male citizens so excluded to the whole number of male citizens over 21 years of age."

Mr. Grimes said he did not know whether he was in favor of the above or not. It came nearer to what he thought ought to be adopted, after the Senate had rejected the proposition before it on Friday, than anything else he had seen presented.

After some other miscellaneous matter, Mr. Sumner, of Massachusetts, said—I ask leave to send to the Chair an amendment, which I hope, at the proper time, to offer as a substitute for the apportionment amendment to the Constitution, which has been under discussion so long in this Chamber. I send it to the Chair and would ask to have it read in order that it shall be printed.

The amendment was read as follows:

Article.—Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States, which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by taking the whole number of persons and excluding Indians not taxed, provided that whenever male citizens of the United States over the age of 21 years shall be excluded from the elective franchise in any State, except for participation in rebellion, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number thus excluded bears to the whole number of male citizens of the United States over the age of 21 years in such State.

Mr. Sumner—I will merely call attention to the fact that that proposition is not open to any charge of evasion, and I hope it will be adopted. In the second place, it contains no words which can imply any recognition of inequality of rights. In the third place, it contains no words which can imply any recognition of the right of a State to disfranchise on account of color or race; therefore it seems to me free from the objections adduced against the pending proposition.

The motion to print the proposed amendment was agreed to.

When the Blair-Conkling amendment was defeated last week in the Senate, Mr. Doolittle offered the following, which is also to be considered at the proper time:

"After the census to be taken in the year 1870, and each succeeding census, representatives shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union according to the number in each State of male electors over twenty-one years of age, qualified by the laws thereof to choose members of the most numerous branch of its Legislature; and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States according to the value of the real and personal taxable property situated in each State, not belonging to the State or the United States."

The first objection to all these is, that they are in the masculine gender. The word *male* seems to have assumed new importance. Neither the word *white, male* nor *slavery* was originally in the Constitution. Sorry "amendments" indeed will they be to it now. There was no need of inserting the word *slavery*, even in the amendment abolishing it, any more than there was for its permission in the beginning. Other language would have been as good, or better. It is a dishonor to the Constitution, and will be while it remains. In it is the monument of our shame to go down the ages. Instead of covering our father's nakedness, we have uncovered our own. We have told posterity, that *we had slavery*, that we hugged our slavery, that we held on to it till God wrenched it from us in judgment, by the iron arm of war! Then as to the word *white*, no other civilized nation on the globe worships it as we do. Even Mr. Sumner's amendment does respect it, notwithstanding the New York *Times* says:

"Mr. Sumner's proposition certainly has the merit of being the most ingenious that has yet been offered. It is so framed as to touch all the various interests which have thus far been found to conflict. It leaves the basis according to population, which will suit New-England. *It makes no allusions to race or color*, which suits Mr. Sumner and his particular friends. It provides that the disfranchisement of rebels by any State shall not lessen its representation, which will suit Tennessee and Missouri, and act as a sort of inducement for loyal men to disfranchise rebels where they have the power, *and at the same time it will reduce the representation of all States which exclude the negro from the right of franchise.*"

There is but one amendment to the Constitution required, and to that all must come at last. Voting for rulers being a natural right, no distinction can be made among persons in the exercise of that right, on account of race, color, or sex, without a violation of that law of nature, which is older, higher, and more sacred than any, or all human constitutions or statutes whatsoever.

We actually grudge our space to what are called "Congressional Proceedings." There is too much truth in what a writer in the New York *Commercial* tells us the President said on Monday as below:

The President, in conversation with gentlemen on Monday, expressed his opinions very freely on the subject of the do-nothing policy of Congress. He said: "Congress has now been in session nearly four months, and what has it done? What is its policy? Can any one answer? It seems to me apparent that it has none. It puts itself in the position of cavilling at all propositions from any one else, and of failing to originate any of its own. It is doing nothing whatever in the way of reconstruction. Texas is at this instant organizing a State Government of its own. If Congress is opposed to my way of reconstruction, and believes this State out of the Union, and its citizens not in a condition to exercise the right of self-government, why does it not depose the Provisional Governor, oust the officers elected by the people, and impose some other and better form of government? Why does Congress adhere to this dog-in-the-manger policy of refusing to recognize the only government that State has, and yet declining to give a better one?" He then referred to Mr. Lincoln's system of reconstruction, and asserted that Tennessee, at least, was entitled to exercise the constitutional prerogatives of a State, by virtue of her action in pursuance of Mr. Lincoln's policy.

On Tuesday the Personal Liberty Bill passed the House by a vote of 109 to 39. It now has to run the gauntlet of the Senate and White House. It provides as follows:

"That all persons born in the United States, and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States, without distinction of color. But the inhabitaints of every race and color without regard to any previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall have the same right to make and enforce contracts, sue, be parties to suits, give evidence, and to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, convey real and personal property, and to have the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains and penalties, and to none other, any law, statute, ordinance, regulation or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."

COLORADO.—In the Senate on Tuesday Mr. Sumner's Amendment to the bill admitting Colorado into the Union came up and was debated at much length. It read as follows:

Provided, That this act shall not take effect, except with the fundamental condition, that within the State there shall be no denial of the elective franchise, or any other right, on account of color or race; and all persons shall be equal before the law; and the inhabitants of the Territory shall, by a majority of the voters, at a meeting publicly convened by the Governor of the Territory, declare their assent to this fundamental condition; and the Governor shall transmit to the President of the United States an authentic statement of such assent, whenever the name shall be given, upon the receipt whereof he shall, by proclamation, announce the fact; whereupon, without any further proceedings in Congress, this act shall take effect.

Mr. Saulsbury, Del., could not vote for the admission of a State with such a small population. He was very glad to see that when the question of negro suffrage was presented, out of a little over 5,000 voters, only 476 were lunatics enough to be in favor of it.

Mr. Grimes, Iowa, opposed the bill.

Mr. Hendricks, Ind., wished to say a word for the sake of disclaiming any intention of voting against the bill from the same motives which induced Mr. Sumner to oppose it. He would not vote against the admission of a State because of the adoption of negro suffrage nor because of its rejection. He was opposed to the admission of Colorado because he did not believe the 15,000 people of Colorado should be entitled to the same rights in the Senate as the 1,300,000 people of Indiana.

Mr. Lane, Kansas, said the arguments of Mr. Hendricks against the admission of Colorado were the same as urged against the admission of Kansas by Mr. Hunter of Virginia and other Southern men. California and Florida were admitted without any enumeration of population. Florida was forced into the Union by the same power to offset the admission of the free State of Iowa.

Mr. Wade, of Ohio, said, though he reported the pending bill, he did so reluctantly, and he was not now in favor of it.

Mr. McDougal, of California, spoke of the limited knowledge there prevailed concerning the far West. The lands of the West were being developed more rapidly than Senators were aware of, and a Territory soon outgrows the requirements of a Territorial Government, and needed representation in Congress. He believed Colorado would be much better off as a State than a Territory.

Mr. Sumner said the population of Colorado had decreased since 1861. In 1861 there were 10,000 and upwards of voters; in 1865 there were less than 6,000.

Mr. Doolittle, of Wisconsin, said he voted for the enabling act in the belief that there were at that time from 40,000 to 50,000 people, and that by the time of the formation of the State Government there would be population enough to entitle them to a Representative in Congress. It would appear, however, that there were but 25,000 people in the Territory when the enabling act was passed, and the population had since been decreasing.

Mr. Cragin, of New Hampshire, believed Congress, by the enabling act, was bound to receive Colorado. He was fully persuaded there was a population of 10,000 in the Territory. He saw no reason now for not admitting the State that did not exist at the time of the passage of the enabling act.

Mr. Sumner withdrew his amendment, and a vote was ordered on the bill, which simply recognizes Colorado as one of the States of the Union.

The yeas and nays were demanded on the motion to order a third reading of the bill, and the Senate refused so to do by the following vote: Yeas 14, nays 21. So the bill failed and Colorado remains as before.

MISS HOLLEY'S LECTURES.—The Olean *Times* of last week says:

In accordance with published notice, a meeting was held on Thursday evening last, at the Presbyterian Church, which was addressed in a lucid and eloquent manner, by Miss Sallie Holley. Miss Holley, by years of devotion to the cause of the colored race, has justly earned the reputation of being one of the "Strong minded women" of America. On entering the pulpit, her appearance was unassuming but dignified, and she spoke with that clear and cogent ability which evinces a comprehensive and well educated mind, and a sincere and zealous devotion to the cause in which she is engaged. She painted in eloquent strains the inhumanity and the wrongs of human slavery—asserted with much force of reasoning the rights of the colored men to "equality before the law" as human beings; and spoke fervidly of the great services rendered by the colored soldiers during the war. She argued that the ballot must be allowed to the black man, and all his rights to manhood acknowledged before the rebel States should be admitted to full participation in the government, and that a general peace and quiet to the country could only thereby be attained. She gave our "accidental" President, some pretty round hits, and defended the position of Congress in relation to the rebel States. She related anecdotes and incidents with which to enliven her discourse.

The following quotation is from a poem by Rev. Charles Kingsley—the words in italic being alterations made by herself in reciting it:

Gather you, gather you, angels of God,
Freedom and Mercy and Truth,
Come for the earth has grown coward and old;
Come down and renew us her youth:
Wisdom, self-sacrifice daring, and love,
Haste to the battle-field, stoop from above
In this day of the Lord—at hand.

And gather you, gather you, hounds of hell,
Plague, famine and war,
Idleness, bigotry, cant and misrule;
Gather and fall in the snare,
Hirelings, mammonites, *Rebels, Copperheads, Traitors* and Knaves,
Crawl to the battle-field—sneak to your graves
In this day of the Lord, at hand, at hand.

Who would sit down and sigh
For a lost age of gold, when the Lord of all ages is here?
True hearts will leap up at the trumpet of God;
And those who can suffer, can dare.
Each old age of gold, was an iron age too,
And the meekest of saints will find stern work to do,
In this day of the Lord, at hand, at hand.

American Anti-Slavery Society.

Acknowledgments from February 1st to March 1st, 1866.

E. Bassett	$3 00	Richard Mott	$3 00
W. P. Brown	3 25	Rev. Photius Fisk	6 00
Walter Brown	3 00	John McKenney	3 00
W. L. Bowditch	5 00	Ellwood Mendenhall	7 00
David Brown	4 00	Hannah Darlington	3 00
Isaac Brooks	3 00	William Still	3 00
Horace Bigelow	6 00	Mary H. Entriken	5 30
P. S. Crowell	3 00	B. B. Chapman	1 00
A. M. Cemont	3 00	Alfred Ford	3 00
James Connelly	1 50	B. B. Griswold	3 00
A. Clapp	7 50	Luke C. Ober	1 50
Peter Fick	3 00	P. Garrettson	2 00
Jesse C. Green	3 00	William Green	3 00
William Geld	3 00	Henry Abbott	6 00
Joseph Griffin	10 00	Mary Buckman	5 75
E. Josselyn	3 00	William Peacock	4 00
Jarvis Lewis	1 50	Hannah Hoxie	2 50
I. Ladner	2 00	E. H. G. Clark	3 00
George Miller	5 00	James Huchins	1 50
J. McMillan	3 00	Mrs. Oliver Dennett	3 00
J. Mendenhall	3 00	Capt. W. F. Goodwin	1 00
J. Pierce	3 00	J. F. Manning	1 50
Daniel Rice	3 00	Rev. Charles H. Brigham	3 00
Mrs. Ives, Salem *Observer*	3 00	Richard Glazier	3 00
J. H. Stephenson	3 00	C. A. Loud	1 00
James E. Udell	3 00	James Jackson	3 00
William Woodbury	3 50	Mrs. Abijah Allen	3 00
I. S. Wilde	3 00	Cornelia Pierce	5 00
George O. Paul	3 00	William H. Herndon	5 00
G. W. Stacy	1 50	Sarah C. Owen	1 00
W. G. Steele	3 00	Miss Joanna Lincoln	3 00
Mrs. M. P. Osborne	3 00	C. L. Beard	3 00
Mrs. H. E. Peck	3 00	J. K. Whitham	7 00
Mrs. Martha Cutler	1 50	George Riker	3 00
Daniel Lowe	3 00	Union	50
Mrs. Elizabeth Wilder	3 00	David Irish	3 00
Thomas E. Longshore	3 00	J. S. Clemmer	5 00
Mary Springstead	3 00	Joseph Ingram	1 00
Mrs. A. Reed	1 50	Mrs. Hewitt	1 50
Peter De Clercq	1 50	T. C. Leland	3 00
Giles & Bouton	3 00	Edwin Dresser	3 00
Thomas Stribling	6 00	Charles Hawes	3 00
Stephen J. W. Taber	3 00	Mrs. Putnam	5 00
D. M. Allen	3 00	Sallie Cadwallader	1 50
Ira Stewart	1 00	Edmund Jackson	5 00
Leander Bigelow	1 50	Ira Gray	3 00
Dr. J. H. Brotherton	3 00	Milo A. Townsend	1 00
Col. L. Wagner	3 00	Lewis Wilhelm	1 50
Samuel L. Fearing	1 50	M. W. Cook	3 00
Abraham Allen	3 00	Edward C. Thomas	1 00
James Thine	3 00	Mahlon Knowles	3 00
James Griffin	3 00	C. V. Paddock	3 00
Rebecca Smith	5 50	Miss Kate Ludlum	3 00
Mrs. Mary Clap	3 00	A. W. Kellogg	1 00
Mrs. M. S. Johnson	3 00	Thomas Chandler	5 00
B. P. Parker	3 00	Phebe Coffin	3 00
Joseph Marsh	3 00	Wm. E. Forster	4 04
Mary A. Jeffries	1 00	P. A. Taylor	4 04
Cynthia S. Green	3 00	Mrs. F. Hill	4 04
Mrs. F. C. M. Henshaw	3 00	Miss Paton	4 04
George O. E. Carlton	3 00	Wilson Armistead	4 04
G. R. Russell	3 00	R. D. Webb	8 08
B. H. Smith	3 00	Mrs. P. A. Taylor	4 04
Otis G. Cheever	3 00	Eliza Wigham	8 08
John Nash	3 00	Miss Ireland	6 60
Chester Nash	3 00	Mrs. Eliza Dodge	4 50
Rev. Rowland Cosner	1 00	Mrs. C. S. Gleason	3 00
Walter M. Scott	1 00	Mary H. Martin	3 00
C. F. Hayward	1 50	Mrs. J. Thirds	3 00
John Horswell	1 50	Mrs. S. J. Pettit	1 50
H. S. Milliman	3 00	Dr. L. Whitney	3 00
Cyrus Howes	3 00	John Kofoed	1 50
Elizabeth L. Com

Miscellaneous Department.

THE GREAT WORSHIP.

BY JOHN G. WHITTIER.

The harp at Nature's advent strung
Has never ceased to play;
The song the stars of morning sung
Has never died away.

And prayer is made, and praise is given,
By all things near and far;
The ocean looketh up to heaven,
And mirrors every star.

Its waves are kneeling on the strand
As kneels the human knee,
Their white locks bowing to the sand,
The priesthood of the sea!

They pour their glittering treasures forth,
Their gifts of pearl they bring,
And all the listening hills of earth
Take up the song they sing.

The green earth sends her incense up
From many a mountain shrine;
From folded leaf and dewy cup
She pours her sacred wine.

The mists above the morning rills
Rise white as wings of prayer;
The altar-curtains of the hills
Are sunset's purple air.

The winds with hymns of praise are loud,
Or low with sobs of pain;
The thunder-organ of the cloud,
The dropping tears of rain.

With drooping head and branches crossed,
The twilight forest grieves,
Or speaks with tongues of Pentecost
From all its sunlit leaves.

The blue sky is the temple's arch,
Its transept earth and air;
The music of its starry march
The chorus of the prayer.

So nature keeps the reverent frame
With which her years began,
And all her signs and voices shame
The prayerless heart of man.

BREAKFAST.

From the Spectator.

BREAKFAST has been a good deal neglected in the literature of gastronomony. The little publication just issued by Mr. Bentley, and edited by some dreadful person who actually gives a receipt for dressed crab as a morning dish, is, we think, the first which has appeared in English devoted exclusively to the early meal. The true gourmand indeed we fancy rather despises breakfast as a mere arrangement for taking sustenance, lacking entirely that trace of science, and sub-flavor of art, and delicate aroma of conviality which, by the consent of civilized mankind in all countries, attach themselves to dinner. The contempt is probably instinctive, for the Australian black in his natural state eats his early handfull of gum or fat insects standing, and squats at ease only when the half-raw opossum is ready for the afternoon enjoyment, but it has been deepened by civilization till breakfast has passed out of the hands of the gastronome into those of the doctor. One feeds oneself, and it is not on feeding that literary cooks can be tempted to display the full resources of their art. In France, indeed, where enjoyment is cultivated as a science, and the nasty compromise between breakfast and dinner called lunch—a meal where one has all the trouble of dining and none of its compensations, where a chop is considered meat, and housewives are not ashamed of hash, and fat porter is substituted for claret,—is unusual, breakfast has been the subject of some care. But then wine is taken at breakfast in France, and the faint odor of refined enjoyment which has always lingered around wine attaches itself even to the breakfast with which it is consumed. There is a possibility of art, of an awakening of the mind, even in some rare instances of a tepid good-fellowship. In India, where coolness is the one source of comfort, where sitting in a draught is Elysium and iced water raises your spirits, and coffee really stimulates, and the chance of cold meat is a separate and infrequent luxury, and breakfast may be as elaborate as dinner without costing a farthing or an exertion, social breakfasting is a recognized habit. In England, however, the meal is eminently one of utility alone. In very good houses you eat it in solitude, or with your wife, at the hour which suits yourself—an arrangement specially designed to make good-fellowship intrusive, and among the middle classes business begins too early. Half of us want to be doing something at ten, and a meal at half-past nine, to be eaten while you are still chilled through, cannot therefore receive much attention. A cut of meat and a cup of coffee is considered sufficient, and often too much, for Englishmen rise too late really to enjoy eating before midday. Not that we mean to say anything in praise of early rising. The man who asserts in a climate like this that it is a virtue to get up at six, and looks at you suspiciously, as doubting your moral fibre, because you get up at ten, ought to be made to wear a hair shirt, or shave with cold water, or use "mottled" soap, or complete his theory of life by some other needless but self-exalting form of physical self-denial. But still the early riser, unpleasant person as he usually is, has the compensation of hunger, which his more self-indulgent friend has not. We have known houses where simplicity was carried much farther than this, where, though dinner was good, breakfast was utterly neglected, the women ate bread and butter, and the men were considered well fed if they got fresh eggs and little scraps of red meat, supposed by courtesy to be bacon. Such contempt for humanity is, however, we are happy to say, becoming rare, and were the question of breakfast only studied with the keenness, ardor and purity of purpose displayed on the greater question of dinner, would speedily be extinct. Of course any real reform on the point must arise from a development of the inward consciousness, a cultivation of the latent conscience of the stomach, but a good deal of external aid can be gained from Mr. Bentley's little brochure. Its editor has made one huge mistake about crab—as if one should begin breakfast with soup—but we have not discovered a second impiety of the kind, and his views upon omelettes are at once orthodox and expansive. There is a little hint about the impropriety of turning omelettes in the frying pan which marks a refined mind, and he has the taste to place the true omelette before those over improved confections in which the first quality of the dish, its croquancy, is destroyed by the intrusion of foreign and comparatively gritty substances.

Before breakfast can assume its proper place among the subjects of art it is necessary to decide what its central idea should be, and not only the central idea, but the central idea applicable to England. Bearing in mind that such of our countrymen as are capable of distinguishing between eating and feeding, who would describe "skilley," for instance, as food, but not as breakfast, are people who will not waste morning time, the idea of breakfast should, we think, be the provision which best fortifies men for the labour of a long day. Women need not be considered, for they get a good mid-day meal, which is to them hot unpleasant, for the children are about, and there is an interval between household supervision and visiting, and by a beneficent provision of nature they are exempt from the temptations of gourmandise. Few women worth a straw care a straw what they eat, and as few men do not care. To the last day of their lives the best and cleverest women will eat the horrid imitations of sponge called buns, and for those who can eat buns with a relish gastronomy is an impertinence. The object is to qualify men for work, and breakfast therefore must consist mainly of eatable solids cold. Not to speak of household convenience, hot meats, and in a less degree even hot fish, require wine, or they leave an unpleasant film upon the palate, and early wine is, on the whole, among a race of industrials living in a chilly climate a mistake. If at all strong it slightly diminishes business keenness and activity, and if very weak leaves neither the warmth which comes of fully satisfied appetite, nor the keenness which slight hunger fosters in city-bred men. The French feel that, and qualify wine and water by a *petit verre* of brandy—the most dangerous habit into which an Englishman can fall. For those who live habitually in the open air beer may possibly be healthy, and it certainly did not hurt our ancestors, but with the majority of their weakly descendants the habit either produces corpulence or a permanent irritability and sense of unrest. The instinct which has led men to milder liquors swallowed hot is, we believe, sound, tea, being injurious only to the sedentary, cocoa only to the fat, and coffee in the morning to nobody, while the heat relieves the faint chill which in this climate a man who has not walked before breakfast is at breakfast sure to feel for nine months in the year. An instinct has in this matter come to the aid of science, but then people who respect their stomachs should draw the obvious deduction from their instincts, and taking mild liquors hot, should take their solids cold. Fried bacon under that rule stands prohibited, and eggs are only allowed hot because no Englishman ever thinks of eating them cold—except when laid by plovers—or has the faintest idea of the kind of "confection" into which the cold yolk of a hard-boiled egg could by a little art be turned. Of solids, meat and bread are of course the best, vegetables being forbidden, first, because they ought to be eaten the moment they are ready, and punctuality at breakfast is an abominable oppression; secondly, because the smell of all vegetables haunts a house; and thirdly, because, except the potato, they do not really strengthen, and breakfast is the doctor's meal. Every variety of cold meat, cold game, potted meat, potted game, potted fish, and those things which though meats, are not usually called meat, tongue, brawn, boar's head, pickled poultry—a luxury absurdly neglected—and ham, are good for the higher objects of breakfast. The best are probably the potted things, and meats which are not meat, because they tempt men to eat bread, the best of all food, and for two reasons too much avoided by the well-to-do. They learn to like flavor, and bread by itself is very flavorless, and it is the custom in England to bake bread in the worst possible way, in such masses that the body of the loaf is a soft, spongy, white mass, very little more edible than a bun. Very good wives will let their husbands "peel the loaf," but even they will not let anybody else, and so the poor men who would eat crust, *i. e.*, good wheat flour properly baked, are forced either to eat flour half raw or abandon the bread for solid meat. Puddings of all kind are an abomination, and Mr. Bentley's editor ought to be ashamed of himself for inserting them in his list. Indeed he is ashamed of them, for the chapter headed "Puddings" is filled with receipts for meat, cheeses, and the peculiarly nasty agglomeration of chopped meat screwed in little bags of entrail called sausages. Cheese is banished from English breakfast-tables, though retained in Holland and some parts of Italy, and its exclusion seems to be based upon nothing more important than a passing fashion. Of lighter things, the *entrées* of the breakfast, eggs are the commonest, prawns, sardines, pickled palates, omelettes, cresses, and caviare are perhaps the best, and a great deal more might be done with the roes of different fish, the sounds of cod, and fish pickled in oil, than has yet been attempted. People are so unenterprising that we doubt if dried mango fish, the Indian delicacy, are procurable in London, and American cranberries, the one "jam" a man may consider it no disgrace to like, never seem to pass through Liverpool. Hot buttered toast, buttered rolls, and soft buttered biscuits are all mistakes, partly for the reasons which should exclude hot meat, and partly from the fact that half-baked flour heated and drowned in butter makes the eater heavy for the day. Fruit is incomparably better at breakfast than at any other time, though so rarely seen in England, where, having the best fruit in the world, we studiously preserve it for the exact moment when we do not want it, and when its flavor spoils that of the wine. We have seen human beings eat strawberries and cream with Lafitte. A little fresh fruit is at breakfast a perfect digester, but in truth it is useless writing about fruit. Englishmen never will know anything about it, except how to grow the best fruits in the world. Nothing in the world comes near the brown greengage, but between the perversity of public taste and the indifference of the Duke of Bedford, who ought to be offered the alternative of quadrupling Covent Garden or attending the House every night for a twelvemonth, a real dish of green-gages, a heaped dish, with six or eight dozens of the fruit in it, costs as much as half a dozen of champagne. Fruit should not be eaten in ones, but in messes, as the Americans eat it, and it would be, did not London set the fashion, while laboring under a monopoly which absolutely forbids even reasonable competition. The idea of breakfast in fact should be cold solids and bread flavored with prepared meat, and within these limits it is possible, as Mr. Bentley's book shows, to secure an almost infinite variety, and to compose a breakfast almost as carefully as a dinner. With three or four alternatives—say ham, cold chicken, potted fish, brawn, sardines, and perhaps mushrooms alone hot, the joint cold, tea, coffee, and cocoa—the last injuriously neglected, owing chiefly to an idea current among cooks that it can be made with water, whereas water should never go near it—even an Englishman may rise to his opportunities, and perceive that though the primary idea of breakfast must always be the vulgar one of food, still due dignity may by art be secured to its position among meals. If the alternatives seem too many, they can be reduced without injury to the great principle, and a slice of the joint, an egg, and a little potted meat or anchovy paste will yield a breakfast sufficient to secure the last of the requisites we intend to suggest.

This is the capacity for eating a considerable meal. There is no time at which the average Englishman really needs a good supply of food so much as at breakfast. At dinner he is exhausted with the day, and wants succulent things and soups, and above all, wine—food which gets into the blood quickly, yet which will not destroy his evening by sending him to sleep. But at breakfast he has not eaten for fourteen hours, and if he shares the antipathy we have expressed to lunch, will not eat again for nine more, and he has really to find fuel for the whole of his most active existence. He wants, or ought to want, a large meal, and we believe great breakfast-eaters are invariably healthy men. Their frames are never exhausted, or tempted to pray on themselves, and make the nerves do the duty of the tissues, like the bodies of those who consider it sound hygiene to fritter away an appetite on tea and toast. They are incurable, for a heart they regard gastronomy as Dr. Colenso regards the Pentateuch, and must be given up, as Archbishops give up that unfortunate prelate; but to the faithful we may still suggest that the hygienic meal of the day—the one to be based most strictly on scientific data, is the one which Englishmen hitherto have most neglected, and in which perhaps only Scotchmen and Anglo-Indians perfectly succeed.

THE FAMOUS ADAMS.—With reference to the National Hall of Statuary, a query raised some eighty odd years ago is about to be revived in our Legislature—the question namely of the famous Adams. It seems apropos and it will certainly be amusing to many readers to excerpt from the autobiography of John Adams the following account of its first interrogation.

The reader will not need to be informed that "Common Sense" was written by Thomas Paine:

"When I arrived in France, the French nation had a great many questions to settle. The first was, Whether I was the famous Adams? *Le fameux Adams. Ah le fameux Adams.*

"In order to speculate a little upon this subject, the pamphlet entitled "Common Sense" had been printed in the Affaires de l'Angleterre et de l'Amerique, and expressly ascribed to Mr. Adams, the celebrated member of Congress—*le célebre membre du Congrès.*

"It must be further known that, although the pamphlet Common Sense was received in France and in all Europe with rapture, yet there were certain parts of it that they did not choose to publish in France. The reasons of this any man may guess. Common Sense undertakes to prove that monarchy is unlawful by the Old Testament. They therefore gave the substance of it, as they said; and, paying many compliments to Mr. Adams, his sense and rich imagination, they were obliged to ascribe some parts to republican zeal. When I arrived at Bordeaux, all that I could say or do would not convince anybody but that I was the famous Adams. "*C'est un homme célebre votre nom est bien connu ici.*' My answer was, It was another gentleman, whose name of Adams you have heard; it is Mr. Samuel Adams, who was excepted from pardon by Gen. Gage's proclamation. '*Oh non, Monsieur, c'est votre modestie.*'

"But when I arrived at Paris I found a very different style. I found great pains taken, much more than the question was worth, to settle the point that I was not the famous Adams. There was such a dread of a sensation; sensations at Paris are important things. I soon found, too, that it was effectually settled in the English newspapers that I was not the famous Adams. Nobody went so far in France or England as to say that I was the infamous Adams. I make no scruple to say that I believe both parties, for parties there were, joined in declaring that I was not the famous Adams.

"I certainly joined both sides in this, in declaring that I was not the famous Adams, because it was the truth.

"It being settled that I was not the famous Adams, the consequence was plain: I was some man that nobody ever heard of before, and therefore a man of no consequence—a cipher. And I am inclined to think that all parties, both in France and England—Whigs and Tories in England, the friends of Franklin, Dean, and Lee, in France—differing in many other things, agreed in this, that I was not the famous Adams.

"Seeing all this and saying nothing—for what could a man say?—seeing also that there were two parties formed among the Americans, as fixed in their aversion to each other as both were to Great Britain, if I had affected the character of a fool, in order to find out the truth and to do good by and by, I should have had the example of Brutus for my justification; but I did not affect this character. I behaved with as much prudence and civility and industry as I could; but still it was a settled point at Paris and in the English newspapers that I was not the famous Adams."—*Boston Transcript.*

BOOK TALK.

From the Boston Post.

WE trust our citizens have not failed to read the recently distributed Thirteenth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Public Library, with the accompanying report of the committee of citizens, appointed for investigating, who seem to have done their duty somewhat more searchingly than their predecessors. It presents some not very unwelcome statements which must be met by intelligent consideration. It could hardly be expected that an institution which has grown to such extent in so few years, as now to number some 150,000 volumes and pamphlets, and whose average daily distribution is over 700 volumes, and whose daily visitors are over a 1,000, could be preserved and ruled without some mistakes. It is very flattering to know that it is open more days and hours than any other similar institution of equal size in the world, and more frequented than any like collection even in cities larger than Boston; all going to show that its privileges are eagerly accepted, and it is reasonable to suppose with ever increasing benefit. But there are one or two drawbacks to our satisfaction in contemplating such a flourishing condition. They may be briefly enumerated in the alarming increase of missing and mutilated books; in the misapplication of the purchasing power, as far as that may cause it, by which, perhaps, the most important of all its departments, that on American history, is defective out of all proportion; in the insufficiency of the present system of recording the books to the borrowers, to prevent gross abuses of the privileges of the institution, and in the permission accorded to very young messengers to bear the books away; in the seeming want of due consideration on the part of the City Council in hazarding the prompt and effective printing of the catalogue by a change in the city printers, out of reasons apparently having no regard to this delicate part of the work they have to do; and in the grave defects of the building itself, against which proper precautions were not originally taken. The committee that have embodied these objections in their report have not, we are persuaded, done so in any captious spirit, and that they have made so marked a protest against evils, is of good omen for the future.

The blame for these faults of omission and commission must seemingly be shared by all concerned—the public at large, the trustees and the City Council. The most difficult question of all to manage is that doubtless in which the frequenters of the library are both most interested and the most to blame. The reports only cautiously intimate an open maliciousness, but believe rather in a simple thoughtlessness on the part of those who abstract and injure books. It has been the experience of years past at the Boston Athenæum that special departments have suffered most in this way, and above all that of theology—a discreditable development to those concerned certainly, who, it is difficult to believe, are so passively prompted, as the plea of simple thoughtlessness would show. To prevent these abuses wholly may not be possible; but in a large measure it can be accomplished, though only by a new system of registration, and unfortunately by the abridgement of the people's privileges. The evil needs to be abated even at this cost. It has been growing, and has been the staple of constant regret hitherto in the reports. The present committee recommend some definite action towards this desirable end.

Ruskin, in his recently published lectures, has made a point of the irreverence for books which pervades his countrymen, and the last *North American* as good as counterparts the assertions as regards ourselves. The flagrant abuse of the privileges bestowed by great libraries certainly tends to exemplify it; but it may well be doubted if in any previous age of the world's history the condition has been better, and if all ages have partaken of this irreverence, the present stores of intellectual importance show what can be done in spite of it. It is certainly disheartening, as well as discreditable, that in throwing open a large library to the public use, such abuse should be contingent. This fact is proved, and it needs must be dealt with intelligently. Above all, it should be borne in mind that no abuse is likely to counterweigh the very evident usefulness of the institution.

The Committee's report upon the various departments of learning, show that none of them are completely represented, and what is strangest, one of the least efficiently kept is that of American History. It gives rise to unsatisfactory deductions. The value of books of all kinds in this department has been materially enhanced of late years, partly by a fashion of large paper copies and contracted editions, and partly by the increased demands arising from the instigations of our own contemporary chronicles, that while we are "making history" so plentifully ourselves, we ought to preserve more abundantly the story of our antecedents. Prices have accordingly been high, and for some of the scarcer works, fluctuating. When the Fowle collection was sold a year ago, books of this description brought prices double, perhaps, on an average, of those which within a few weeks have been obtained for the same books at Mr. Leonard's sales. It would seem desirable, however, that an American library, aiming at the public usefulness, should above all things be complete in just this department. What the British Museum can do ought certainly to have no difficulty for Boston in this particular. If that library makes it a point to omit buying no original work in American history, of however a local nature, there ought not to be difficulties in the way here. It would be painful to think that any rule, like the most books for the least money, should guide in the selection of the accessions to our Public Library. It is very gratifying to have the sum total of volumes run up largely every year; but it is certainly more desirable to have proper books than many. If a single volume that costs five or ten dollars may seem a small return for the money, compared with the piles of useless lumber that may be procured at Mr. Burnham's for the same amount, it may certainly be worth somebody's while to inquire which purchase would be most advantageous, intrinsically, to the institution. It seems to us that the department of American History should not be kept defective, but, on the contrary, above all others, should be kept as near complete as possible, irrespective of any cost, as long as funds accrue for purchasing books at all. The books, which, if we are correctly informed, are chiefly wanting in this department, are those of this increased value, the bulk of which, doubtless, can never again be purchased so favorably as at the time of their issue. The library is apparently increasing full as rapidly as is desirable, or as the books can be properly catalogued and arranged; and it may not be an error, we submit, that for one year the experiment should be tried of supplying very marked omission in its catalogue, rather than increasing its bulk materially. The committees suggestion of extending the agencies of the library outside of Boston, and into all the chief book-marts, as a beginning of this work, is not without value. At all events, that portion of the committee's report pertaining to this department, is not at all creditable to those having the matter in charge.

THE MONSTER BELLS OF THE WORLD.—In making large bells, loudness rather than pitch is the object, as the sound can be conveyed to a much further extent. This accounts for the enormous weight of some of the largest bells. St. Paul's, for instance, weighs 13,000 pounds; the bell of Antwerp, 16,000 pounds; Oxford, 17,000 pounds; the bell at Rome, 19,000 pounds; Mechlin, 20,000 pounds; Bruges, 23,000 pounds; York, 24,000 pounds, Cologne, 25,000 pounds; Montreal, 29,000 pounds; Erfurt, 30,00 pounds; "Big Ben," at the House of Parliament, 31,000 pounds; Seus, 34,000 pounds; Vienna, 40,000 pounds; Novgorod, 69,000 pounds; Pekin, 139,000 pounds; Moscow, 141,000 pounds. But, as yet, the greatest bell ever known is another famous Moscow bell, which was never hung. It was cast by the order of the Empress Anne in 1653. It lies broken on the ground, and is estimated to weigh 443,772 pounds. It is nineteen feet high, and measures around the margin sixty-four feet. No wonder that it has never been suspended.

There are few bells of interest in the United States. The heaviest is probably the alarm bell on the City Hall in New York, weighing about 23,000 pounds.

As the Russians make their pilgrimage to the great Moscow bell and regard it with superstitious veneration, so the American citizen honors and venerates the old Independence bell at Philadelphia, for he is not only reminded of the glory of the Revolution, but he believes, now more than ever, since the injunction has been obeyed, its inscription—"Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

AFRICA AND ITS PEOPLE.

DU CHAILLU RELATES HIS TRAVELS.

THIS distinguished explorer addressed the Royal Geographical Society recently in London, when he related some of his wonderful stories of Africa. He said his object in visiting that country again was to study aboriginal nature, man, in his customs, superstitions, language, and legends. He had little doubt that the Equatorial tribes, from west to east, came from one parent stock, and he founded this opinion partly on some natives' words of the east tribes, which he found quoted in Capt. Burton's book on Grant's journey. There was a long, low belt of country extending from west to east, always cloudy, although equatorial, and of a temperature very high, 98 deg, at 1 p.m.; and the minimum in July being from 60 to 64 deg. A striking circumstance was the decrease of the population, not attributable to the fire-water of the white man, but quite independent of the influence of the latter.

M. du Chaillu left London for Africa on the 5th August, 1863, and reached Fernandez River on the 9th October following. Here he unfortunately lost his scientific instruments, and nearly was lost himself, when he found himself at the head waters of the Okanda river. Although he had only five men and five boys, he felt that among that friendly and to him well-known tribe he was quite safe. He was well received by the King of Ashira, who made love to both himself and his goods, and he was also beset with offers of marriage from a great many ladies, whom he found, since his former journey, had taken to some small use of raiment as increasing their personal attractions. In one of his journeys from the neighborhood he encountered some ten gorillas, among which (or whom?) was an old male who exceedingly frightened the traveller, he being without a gun. His followers, however, came up, and by shouts set the gorillas to flight. He therefore had to retract his former opinion that the gorilla was not gregarious. He had also found that a gorilla might be captured alive, as his negroes had actually captured one, with its young. With these exceptions he had nothing to retract about the gorilla that he had stated in his former book.

In the waterfalls a little above Samba, on the Fernandez river, he had never seen such a terrible rush of water; in fact, the natives imagined that a spirit abided in these waters and caused the turmoil. Meantime, a fierce and deadly plague of small pox had ravaged the Ashira country, and filled the whole land with wailing and sorrow. M. du Chaillu sent away his guide and followers, with much of his property, to save them. Others of them succumbed; the King Olamba, his friend, also died, and he was accused of killing him. He was then there alone, and felt extremely miserable and in continued fear, having to perform all the most menial offices for himself and his boys, who were down. The people looked upon him as the cause of the plague, and he departed for the Otando country. On the journey the supplies of food failed, and the third day they had only three monkeys for eleven men, and they found them very good. [Laughter.] The King of Otando fell ill, but recovered. He was a good fellow, and had plenty of common sense. He sent him (M. du Chaillu) plenty of food, cooked by his own wives. He (the traveller) did not much like this, not for fear of poison, but from what he knew of the custom called "alombi." This was the custom:

They cut off a great man's head, put it in a box with a composition of chalk, and as the head decomposed it mingled with the chalk. This mixture they give to any guest from whom they desire to receive gifts of kindness, under the impression that if he eats of their relatives' bones he becomes as one of themselves. In the Napono country, which lies to the southeast of the Otando country, the people were brave, all the men wore swords, and all were drunk from morning till night—their drink being distilled from the sugar-cane, honey, the plantain, and the plane tree. The people were divided into clans, like the Scotch, the children following the mother's clan, and the nephew's or sister's son succeeding, instead of the direct descendant.

M. du Chaillu, speaking of a neighboring people Ishaugo, showed some specimens of their palm fibre fabrics, which they wore as clothes, much better in quality than the cotton cloths which Manchester sends to Africa. [Laughter.] They were very gentle people, and living among them, or in neighboring tribes, were tribes quite nomad, like gipsies, who lived much like gipsies. Passing almost due eastward, and traversing another range of mountains, where it was always cloudy and rainy they reached Monaco Kombo. Willing to leave on account of the rainy weather, they were still detained by the King, who said he thought himself made little of by their intended departure. The King received them, and promised, as he was a man of a true heart, that the travellers would be allowed to go on the next day. But in firing guns to amuse the court with the noise they made, a man was accidentally killed, and a great commotion and excitement was caused, and no palaver could be obtained to explain the circumstance. Things looked threatening, and M. du Chaillu ordered his men to retreat, which they did in good order: but some of them were wounded, as was also the leader of the expedition himself, by the murderous arrows shot at them.

Ultimately, however, a panic seized his followers, who cast away the precious articles they had to carry; he himself had dropped his sextant, in order to save the ammunition he bore. They had to fight their way from nine a.m. to five p.m., to pass through the villages, and to repulse the pursuers five times during the day. They had eaten nothing since the day before. That night they passed in the forest. At midnight they got up, and with great caution proceeded to pass through the village lying before them, which they did without interruption. The chief met them, said he had heard of the accident, and told them they might move on, as he wanted no war with the white man. So they retraversed the path they had originally followed toward the coast. M. du Chaillu reached the coast, saving all his guns save one rifle, but he had still more guns than people. Here he took ship for England, but was nearly wrecked at the entrance of Dartmouth harbor. He had been in rags on leaving Africa, and on the voyage had to wear clothes lent to him. He reached London in clothes borrowed from the Captain, and with money borrowed from some of the passengers. In conclusion, M. du Chaillu expanded into a very warm and emotionate expression of thanks to Sir R. Murchison for his manifold kindness formerly and since. His spoils he had left upon the battle-field, but that was inevitable. To all his friends he expressed his warm thanks, and he sat down amid great applause.

Professor Owen then spoke in support of the veracity of M. du Chaillu, remarking that all the statements for which he had been most attacked had been borne out by subsequent evidence. He had, for instance, made the unwelcome announcement that he had met with a race of cannibals. That statement had been called in question; but it had been confirmed by Capt. Burton, who had followed him over the district he had traversed. Then with respect to the gorillas, he felt sure that if M. du Chaillu had given any false account of their habits he should have found some traces of that falsehood in the knowledge he had been able to obtain of the conformation of those animals. He had not, however, the slightest reason to suppose that what had been said by M. du Chaillu on the subject was in the slightest respect untrue. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Dunkin, one of the assistants of the Greenwich Observatory, then came forward and stated that he had been astonished at the multitude and the accuracy of the astronomical observations which M. du Chaillu had made.

Mr. J. Crawford, the chairman, said he felt it to be his duty to declare that he found it impossible to believe in the existence of a race of dwarfs which M. du Chaillu stated he had met in Africa. These people, if the statement was correct, were smaller than any human beings that had yet been known, and he could not understand how it was possible that they could live in the midst of other races, who appeared to speak the same language.

M. du Chaillu observed that those people ran away when he approached them, and he had been able to examine only one or two of their number; but with respect to them, he had only to repeat facts as they came under his observation. (Hear hear.)

AN ANECDOTE OF WEBSTER.—The Worcester *West Chronicle*, a local newspaper lately started at Barre, relates the following anecdote as taken from the lips of a venerable compositor employed in its office:

"Just after Webster delivered his reply to Hayne, the firm I was then at work for bought a revised copy of the manuscript in order to publish that and Hayne's speech in a bound volume together. One day, as I was at work upon it, Mr. Webster came into the office, and walking up to my stand with the 'proof-sheet' in his hand, said: 'Young man,—I was a younger man once than I am now,—how do you find the manuscript? The Washington printers make great complaints about it.' Said I: 'Mr. Webster, your handwriting *is* rather obscure; but then I consider your diction remarkably sound!' Mr. Webster looked at me a moment, and then put a hand in his pocket, and giving me a dollar, walked out without another word. But I had to spend that dollar as soon as he had gone."

CONSTITUTION

LIFE SYRUP,

COMPOSED OF

IODIDE POTASSIUM,

With the Compound Concentrated Fluid Extract of

VALUABLE MEDICINAL

ROOTS AND HERBS,

A positive and specific remedy for all diseases originating from an IMPURE STATE OF THE BLOOD, and for all (hereditary) DISEASES transmitted from PARENT TO CHILD.

SCROFULA

STRUMA. GLANDULAR SWELLINGS. ULCERATION.
KING'S EVIL. ERYSIPELAS. SALT RHEUM.

This taint (HEREDITARY and ACQUIRED), filling life with untold misery, is by all usual medical remedies incurable.

RHEUMATISM.

[ARTHRITIS.] NEURALGIA. GOUT.
LUMBAGO. SCIATICA. TIC DOLOUREUX.

If there is any disease in which the Constituton Life Syrup is a sovereign, it is in Rheumatism and its kindred affections. The most intense pains are almost immediately alleviated—enormous swellings are reduced. Cases, chronic or vicarious, of 20 or 30 years standing, have been cured by us.

NERVOUSNESS.

NERVOUS DEBILITY. SHATTERED NERVES. ST. VITUS' DANCE.
LOSS OF POWER. CONFUSION OF THOUGHTS. EPILEPSY.

Thousands who have suffered for years will bless the day on which they read these lines. Particularly to weak, suffering woman will this medicine prove an inestimable blessing—directing their footsteps to a Hope which fulfils more than it promises.

MERCURIAL DISEASES.

SALIVATION. ROTTING OF BONES.
BAD COMPLEXION. ACHES IN BONES.
FEELING OF WEARINESS. DEPRESSION OF SPIRITS.

CONSTITUTION LIFE SYRUP purges the system entirely from all the evil effects of MERCURY, removing the Bad Breath, and curing the Weak Joints and Rheumatic Pains which the use of Calomel is sure to produce. It hardens Spongy Gums and secures the teeth as firmly as ever.

Constitution Life Syrup

eradicates, root and branch, all Eruptive Diseases of the Skin, like

ULCERS, PIMPLES, BLOTCHES,

and all other difficulties of this kind, which so much disfigure the outward appearance of both males and females, often making them a disgusting object to themselves and their friends.

Constitution Life Syrup

cures all Swelling of the Glands, either of the Face, Neck, or Female Breast, and should be taken as soon as the swelling is detected, thus preventing their breaking, and producing troublesome Discharging Sores, which disfigure so many of the younger portion of the community, from six to twenty years of age. Young children are very subject to Discharges from the Ears, which depends upon a Scrofulous constitution. These cases soon recover by taking a few doses of the Life Syrup.

Epileptic Fits, Sympathetic or Organic Diseases of the Heart, as Palpitation, Disease of the Valves, producing a grating or filing sound, Dropsy of the Heart Case and all the affections of this important organ (persons suffering from any acute pain in the region of the heart) will be greatly relieved by Constitution Life Syrup.

BROKEN-DOWN AND DELICATE CONSTITUTIONS.

SUFFERING FROM INDISPOSITION TO EXERTION, PAIN IN THE BACK, LOSS OF MEMORY, FOREBODINGS, HORROR OF CALAMITY, FEAR OF DISEASE, DIMNESS OF VISION, DRY, HOT SKIN AND EXTREMITIES, WANT OF SLEEP, RESTLESSNESS, PALE, HAGGARD COUNTENANCE, AND LASSITUDE OF THE MUSCULAR SYSTEM, all require the aid of the CONSTITUTION LIFE SYRUP.

FOR ALL FORMS OF

ULCERATIVE DISEASES.

either of the NOSE, THROAT, TONGUE, SPINE, FOREHEAD OR SCALP, no remedy has ever proved its equal.

MOTH PATCHES upon the female face depending upon a diseased action of the Liver, are very unpleasant to the young wife and mother. A few bottles of Constitution Life Syrup will correct the secretion, and remove the deposit which is directly under the skin.

In Diseases of the Liver, giving rise to Languor, Dizziness, Indigestion, Weak Stomach, or an ulcerated or cancerous condition of that organ, accompanied with burning or other unpleasant symptoms, will be relieved by the use of CONSTITUTION LIFE SYRUP.

☞ As a general Blood-Purifying Agent, the Life Syrup stands unrivalled by any preparation in the world.

Diseases of the Spine, as usually developed in the young, Hip Disease, Neuralgia, and all Nervous Diseases, and Ladies who are suffering from Diseases for which they are at a loss to know what to do, we would advise the use of CONSTITUTION LIFE SYRUP. It will restore their pallid countenance, strengthen their weak back and side, give them new energy, new life and happiness.

THE RICH AND POOR

are liable to the same diseases. Nature and Science have made the Constitution Life Syrup for the benefit of all.

PURE BLOOD

produces healthy men and women; and if the constitution is neglected in youth, disease and early death is the result.

TO MOTHERS AND MARRIED LADIES.

It is the safest and most effectual medicine ever discovered for purifying the system and relieving the suffering attendant upon childbirth. It strengthens both the mother and the child, prevents pain and disease, and increases and enriches the food. Those who have used it think it indispensable. It is highly useful, both before and after confinement, as it prevents disease attendant upon childbirth.

WM. H. GREGG, M. D.,
Sole Proprietor, New York.

MORGAN & ALLEN,
Wholesale Druggists,
Agents,
46 Cliff street, New York.

THE GREAT STRENGTHENING TONIC!

(NOT A WHISKEY PREPARATION.)

HOOFLAND'S

GERMAN BITTERS,

WILL CURE

DEBILITY! DEBILITY!

Resulting from any cause whatsoever.

H

PROSTRATION OF THE SYSTEM

INDUCED BY

SEVERE HARDSHIPS,
EXPOSURE,
FEVERS,
OR
DISEASES OF CAMP LIFE.

SOLDIERS, CITIZENS, MALE OR FEMALE, ADULT OR YOUTH,

will find this Bitters a pure Tonic, not dependent on bad liquors for their almost miraculous effects.

O

DYSPEPSIA,

AND DISEASES RESULTING FROM DISORDERS OF THE LIVER AND DIGESTIVE ORGANS,

ARE CURED BY

HOOFLAND'S GERMAN BITTERS.

This Bitters has performed more cures, gives better satisfaction, has more testimony, has more respectable people to vouch for it, than any other article in the market

O

We defy any one to contradict this assertion, and

WILL PAY $1,000

to any one who will produce a certificate published by us that is not genuine

HOOFLAND'S GERMAN BITTERS,

WILL CURE EVERY CASE OF

CHRONIC OR NERVOUS DEBILITY

AND

DISEASES OF THE KIDNEYS.

F

Observe the following Symptoms, resulting from Disorders of the Digestive Organs:

Constipation, Inward Piles, Fulness of Blood to the Head, Acidity of the Stomach, Nausea, Heartburn, Disgust for Food, Fulness or Weight in the Stomach, Sour Eructations, Sinking or Fluttering at the Pit of the Stomach, Swimming of the Head, Hurried and Difficult Breathing, Fluttering at the Heart, Choking or Suffocating Sensations when in a lying posture, Dimness of Vision, Dots or Webs before the Sight, Fever and Dull Pain in the Head, Deficiency of Perspiration, Yellowness of the Skin and eyes, Pain in the Side, Back, Chest, Limbs, etc., Sudden Flushes of Heat, Burning in the Flesh, Constant Imaginings of Evil, Great Depression of Spirits.

L

REMEMBER,

that this Bitters is not Alcoholic, contains no Rum or Whiskey, and cannot make Drunkards, but is the Best Tonic in the World.

READ WHO SAYS SO.

* * * * * * * * *

[From the Rev. W. D. Seigfried, Pastor of Twelfth Baptist Church, Phil.]

GENTLEMEN: I have recently been laboring under the distressing effects of indigestion, accompanied by a prostration of the nervous system. Numerous remedies were recommended by friends, and some of them tested, but without relief. Your Hoofland's German Bitters were recommended by persons who had tried them, and whose favorable mention of these Bitters induced me to try them. I must confess that I had an aversion to Patent Medicines from the "thousand and one" quack "Bitters," whose only aim seems to be to palm off sweetened and drugged liquor upon the community in a sly way, and the tendency of which, I fear, is to make many a confirmed drunkard. Upon learning that yours was really a medicinal preparation, I took it, with happy effect. Its action, not only upon the stomach, but upon the nervous system, was prompt and gratifying. I feel that I have derived great and permanent benefit from the use of a few bottles. Very respectfully yours,

W. D. SEIGFRIED, No. 264 Shackamaxon st.

A

[From the Rev. E. D. Fendall, Assistant Editor *Christian Chronicle*, Phil.]

I have derived decided benefit from the use of Hoofland's German Bitters, and feel it my privilege to recommend them as a most valuable tonic, to all who are suffering from general debility or from diseases arising from derangement of the liver.

Yours truly, E. D. FENDALL.

[From Rev. D. Merrige, Pastor of the Passyunk Baptist Church, Phil.]

From the many respectable recommendations given to Dr. Hoofland's German Bitters, I was induced to give them a trial After using several bottles I found them to be a good remedy for debility, and a most excellent tonic for the stomach.

D. MERRIGE.

From Rev. Wm. Smith, formerly Pastor of the Vincentown and Millville (N. J.) Baptist Churches.]

Having used in my family a number of bottles of your Hoofland's German Bitters, I have to say that I regard them as an excellent medicine, specially adapted to remove the diseases they are recommended for. They strengthen and invigorate the system when debilitated, and are useful in disorders of the liver, loss of appetite, etc. I have also recommended them to several of my friends, who have tried them, and found them greatly beneficial in the restoration of health.

Yours truly, WILLIAM SMITH,
906 Hutchinson street, Phil.

N

[From the Rev. Joseph H. Kennard, Pastor of the Tenth Baptist Church.]

I have been frequently requested to connect my name with commendations of different kinds of medicines, but reg